arXiv:1112.0415v2 [math.AP] 10 May 2012

WELL-POSEDNESS AND SPECTRAL PROPERTIES OF HEAT AND WAVE EQUATIONS WITH NON-LOCAL CONDITIONS

DELIO MUGNOLO AND SERGE NICAISE

Abstract. We consider the one-dimensional heat and wave equations but – instead of boundary conditions – we impose on the solution certain non-local, integral constraints. An appropriate Hilbert setting leads to an integration-by-parts formula in Sobolev spaces of negative order and eventually allows us to use semigroup theory leading to analytic well-posedness, hence sharpening regularity results previously obtained by other authors. In doing so we introduce a parametrization of such integral conditions that includes known cases but also shows the connection with more usual boundary conditions, like periodic ones. In the self-adjoint case, we even obtain the so-called Weyl formula for the eigenvalue asymptotics.

1. Introduction

Several problems in the applied sciences are modelled by partial differential equations on domains that, as such, require the modeller to impose some assumption on the sought-after solution in order to obtain well-posedness in some function space. Typical are, of course, boundary conditions like Dirichlet or Neumann ones. However, in many physical problems certain different constraints are natural: for example, all equations that are derived from conservation laws – like the Cahn–Hilliard equation or the Navier–Stokes equation – admit the conservation of a certain physical quantity (e.g. mass, barycenter, energy, or momentum) and it is natural to wonder whether already these *minimal* constraints suffice to obtain well-posedness, at least for a special choice of the initial conditions. While this idea seem to be widely applicable, in this paper we restrict for simplicity to both the heat and the wave equations on an interval. Instead of usual boundary conditions on the solution u, we investigate the role of non-local, integral conditions like

$$\int_0^1 u(t,x)dx = 0, \qquad t \geq 0, \tag{1.1}$$

This amounts to imposing that the moment of order 0 (corresponding e.g. to the total mass, in the case of a diffusion equation for which u denotes the relative density of a mixture) vanishes identically. A heat equation complemented by the above condition has been introduced by J.R. Cannon in [11], where well-posedness was investigated by methods based on abstract Volterra equations. While Cannon's work has received much attention by numerical analysts, it has gone largely overlooked by the PDE community, with some notable exceptions (cf. [21, 35, 33] and the references therein to earlier soviet literature). The fact that (1.1) only eliminates one degree of freedom still forced Cannon and later investigators to impose a local (say, Dirichlet) condition in one of the endpoints.

More recently, it has been observed that the local condition in 0 or 1 may be dropped and replaced by another condition on the moment of order 1, like

$$\int_0^1 (1-x)u(t,x)dx = 0, \qquad t \geq 0. \tag{1.2}$$

Wave and heat equations with (generalizations of) conditions (1.1) and (1.2) have been intensively studied by A. Bouziani and L.S. Pul'kina in a long series of papers that seems to begin with [31] and [8]. In [6], a condition on the moment of order 2 is discussed. In fact, over the last 20 years Bouziani, Pul'kina and their coauthors have discussed a manifold of hyperbolic, parabolic and pseudoparabolic equations with such conditions, mostly by numerical methods. Among others, in [7, 16, 20] several weaker well-posedness results for related parabolic,

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47D06, 35J20, 34B10.

Key words and phrases. Non-local conditions; Analytic semigroups; Quadratic forms; Weyl asymptotics.

This article has been partly written while the first author was visiting the University of Valenciennes. He would like to thank the University of Valenciennes for the hospitality.

hyperbolic or pseudoparabolic equations have been obtained by different methods. Semigroup theory has never been applied, to the best of our knowledge, but we emphasize that non-local conditions related to those considered by Pul'kina also appear in the theory of Feller semigroups (see e.g. [34, Chapt. 13]). It should be mentioned that a few tentative extensions of the above conditions for heat or wave equations on higher dimensional domains have been proposed in the literature, cf. [27, 32]. However, finding an abstract general setting still seems to be an open problem. An extensive list of papers dealing with these or similar conditions can be found in the introduction on [17].

The main goal of this article is to provide an abstract framework – as general as possible –for studying the one-dimensional heat or wave equation with integral conditions by means of semigroup theory. It turns out that, for the spatial operator we are considering, the associated diffusion equation is the gradient flow of a very simple functional – up to lower order terms, it is in fact simply the L^2-norm – with respect to some H^{-1}-type inner product. This is not surprising: for example, it is well-known that the gradient flow associated to the L^p-norm with respect to the $H^{-1}(0,1)$-inner product is the porous medium equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Also the observation that replacing $H^{-1}(0,1)$ by $H^{-1}(T)$ permits to realize the diffusion equation with integral conditions as a gradient flow is not entirely new: for example, it is implicitely used in several articles by F. Otto (see e.g. [22]) to discuss some modifications of the Cahn–Hilliard equation. However, by some direct computations performed in Sections 3 and 4 it turns out that the $H^{-1}(T)$-norm, although natural, gives rise to a gradient flow that agrees with the usual diffusion equation only in a suitable quotient space (see Lemma 2.4 for details). This surprising fact seems to show that the usual second derivative is not suitable to be endowed with (nonlocal) moment conditions. Indeed, also the associated second order (in time) evolution equation is not the classical wave equation, but rather a non-trivial generalization that coincides with the usual one only for smooth initial data, cf. Theorem 3.9. In the case of the heat equation, instead, this phenomenon can actually be overcome by invoking the smoothing properties of the analytic semigroups yielded by our approach.

The main difficulty associated with our variational approach is that less regular functions suffer a dramatical deterioration of their properties when integrated by parts even against smooth functions. In turn, this yields that the evolution equation associated with the above mentioned gradient flow is, seemingly, an exotic parabolic equation with no evident physical interpretation, see e.g. Theorem 4.3. In order to get rid of these effects, in all the above mentioned papers (see e.g. [13, 9]) the initial data were assumed to have an artificially strong regularity (and the solutions were only shown to satisfy the equation in a weak sense). Our semigroup approach allows us to avoid this problem and to obtain a classical solution even for rough initial data, cf. Theorems 3.7–4.8.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the basic notations and prove some technical lemmata along with an integration-by-parts-type formula that will prove quite useful, since we are forced to work in Sobolev spaces of negative order so that the usual Gauß–Green formulae do not apply immediately.

We further discuss a class of quasi-accretive extensions of the second derivative with non-local constraints, but due to technical reasons we have to tackle two subcases: the analysis of the corresponding parabolic and hyperbolic problems will be performed in Section 3 and Section 4, respectively. In fact, by introducing two parameters (a subspace Y of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and a 2×2-matrix K, respectively) we are able to treat an infinite class of non-local constraints.

In some particular cases, the spatial operator is even self-adjoint. In Section 5 we are able to describe the spectrum of several self-adjoint extensions of the "minimal" second order derivative, by more or less elementary techniques. We can even show that, suprisingly, the so-called Weyl formula is still valid for this class of operators.

We end up with some direct extensions of our results to the case of dynamic integral conditions, see section 6, which in turn by known semigroup theoretical methods allow to treat *inhomogeneous* integral conditions.

As observed above, it seems that following the original article by Cannon, in the literature the attention has been devoted mostly to problems in which mixed boundary/integral conditions are considered, see e.g. [33] as well as [12, §7.5] and references therein. It should be emphasized that this kind of problems is slightly different from ours: in fact, it seems to be impossible to fix our parameters Y, K in such a way that a homogeneous Dirichlet condition in one endpoint can be recovered, cf. Remark 4.7. Nor we are able to treat generalizations of (1.1) that have enjoyed some popularity in the literature, like *time-dependent*, mixed boundary/integral constraints of the form

$$u(t,0) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_0^{b(t)} u(t,x)dx = 0, \qquad t \geq 0,$$

for some given function b that satisfies a suitable smoothness assumption, as in the original paper by Cannon [11], or even

$$\int_0^{b(t)} u(t,x)dx = \int_{b(t)}^1 u(t,x)dx = 0, \qquad t \geq 0,$$

as considered in [24].

Conversely, it seems that the methods in the quoted articles cannot be adapted to our general setting. Furthermore, we could not find any previous reference to a classification of self-adjoint integral conditions as the one we perform in Section 4. Most importantly, our operator theoretical approach is based on energy methods and C_0-semigroups. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first time these kinds of problems are studied in this framework.

In fact, our technique present quite a few advantages over alternative methods: first of all, we deliver a unified approach that allows to treat simultaneously a whole class of integral constraints (including those in (1.1)-(1.2)); secondly, it suffices to us to prove well-posedness of the undamped wave equation to obtain automatically, by perturbation methods and the general theory of C_0-semigroups, well-posedness of, among others, the telegraph equation and the heat equation. We are also able to enlarge the space on which well-posedness is given, in comparison with previous literature: e.g., in [7] the author needs to impose a compatibility condition on the first moment of the initial value, which we can instead drop.

However, the most important by-product of the semigroup approach pursued by us is that valuable information becomes available about the solution operators, in comparison with other techniques: e.g., we obtain analyticity of the semigroup that governs the heat equation. This in turn yields the fact that the solution u is smooth with respect to both the time and space variables and automatically satisfies additional boundary conditions, cf. Corollary 4.10. This should be compared with the much weaker regularity results obtained in [13, §3] or [9, §5] by means of a Galerkin method. Moreover, in this way we are also able to prove that solutions of the heat equation automatically satisfy infinitely many (non-local) *boundary* conditions along with the integral ones. Also this observation, which is actually a straightforward consequence of our semigroup approach, seems to be new.

2. The Bouziani space

If we consider $(0,1)$ as the torus T, then the test function set $\mathcal{D}(T)$ is in fact the set of smooth functions in $[0,1]$ such that the derivatives at all orders coincide at 0 and 1. In the same manner we will use the Sobolev space $H^1(T)$, by which we denote the subspace of those $u \in H^1(0,1)$ such that $u(0) = u(1)$ (i.e., of those H^1-functions supported on the torus). We denote by $H^{-1}(T)$ its dual.

Remark 2.1. *It is clear that $H^1_0(0,1) \hookrightarrow H^1(T)$, but this embedding is not dense. Therefore, using $L^2(0,1)$ as a pivot space, their dual spaces $H^{-1}(0,1)$ and $H^{-1}(T)$ do* not *satisfy the reverse embedding, as one may naively expect: for instance, the Dirac functional δ_1 lies in $H^{-1}(T)$ and is not trivial there, but it agrees with the 0 functional in $H^{-1}(0,1)$. For the same reason, each element of $\mathcal{D}'(T)$ can be identified with an element of $\mathcal{D}'(0,1)$ but this identification operator is* not *injective. This identification operator, which we dub Id_m, will be investigated in more detail in the following.*

Now for $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, we can define a primitive of $-\varphi + \int_0^1 \varphi(z)dz$ by

$$J\varphi(x) := \int_x^1 \left(\varphi(y) - \int_0^1 \varphi(z)dz\right) dy, \qquad x \in (0,1),$$

and therefore for $u \in \mathcal{D}'(T)$ we define its primitive $Pu \in \mathcal{D}'(T)$ by

$$\langle Pu, \varphi\rangle := \langle u, J\varphi\rangle, \qquad \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(T). \tag{2.1}$$

Note that

$$\langle Pu, 1\rangle = 0, \qquad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}'(T). \tag{2.2}$$

As a primitive is defined up to a constant, this means that we have chosen the constant in such a way that Pu is of zero mean, i.e., $\langle Pu, 1\rangle = 0$.

Now, by definition $\langle (Pu)', \varphi\rangle = -\langle Pu, \varphi'\rangle = -\langle u, J\varphi'\rangle$. But since φ is periodic,

$$J\varphi'(x) = \int_x^1 \varphi'(y)dy = \varphi(1) - \varphi(x) \qquad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(T),$$

or rather

$$\langle (Pu)', \varphi\rangle = \langle u, \varphi\rangle - \varphi(1)\langle u, 1\rangle \qquad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(T).$$

Hence the identity

$$(Pu)' = u - \langle u, 1\rangle \delta_1, \qquad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}'(T) \tag{2.3}$$

holds. As $(Pu)'$ is not necessarily equal to u, the name "primitive of u" for Pu is a little bit usurped, but is justified by the fact that $(Pu)' = u$ on the space of distributions $u \in \mathcal{D}'(T)$ of zero mean (in the sense that $\langle u, 1\rangle = 0$) and also on $\mathcal{D}'(0,1)$. Note finally that

$$P\delta_1 = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(T), \tag{2.4}$$

since $\langle P\delta_1, \phi\rangle = \langle \delta_1, J\phi\rangle = J\phi(1) = 0$ which is quite surprising but is in accordance with (2.3).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $u \in L^2(0,1)$. Then Pu is given by*

$$Pu(x) = \mathcal{I}u(x) - \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^x u(y)dy \right) dx, \qquad \forall x \in (0,1), \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}u(x) := \int_0^x u(y)dy, \qquad x \in (0,1).$$

In particular, $Pu \in H^1(0,1)$ and $(Pu)' = u$ in $\mathcal{D}'(0,1)$. Moreover, P is a bounded linear operator from $H^{-1}(T)$ to $L^2(0,1)$.

Proof. First we remark that for $u \in L^2(T)$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, we have

$$\langle Pu, \varphi\rangle = \int_0^1 (\mathcal{I}u)'(x) J\varphi(x)\, dx.$$

Hence by integration by parts, we obtain

$$\langle Pu, \varphi\rangle = \int_0^1 (\mathcal{I}u)(x) \left(\varphi(x) - \int_0^1 \varphi(z)dz \right) dx,$$

since the boundary terms vanish due to $(\mathcal{I}u)(0) = J\varphi(1) = 0$. This shows (2.5) and that Pu belongs to $L^2(T)$.

In a second step we first easily check that for $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, $J\varphi$ is in $H^1(T)$ (it is even in $H^1_0(0,1)$) and that

$$\|J\varphi\|_{H^1_0(0,1)} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{L^2}.$$

According to (2.1) we then get

$$|\langle Pu, \varphi\rangle| \le \|u\|_{H^{-1}(T)} \|J\varphi\|_{H^1_0(0,1)} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^{-1}(T)} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}.$$

This proves that

$$\|Pu\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^{-1}(T)}, \qquad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}(T),$$

and hence also the claimed assertion by density of $\mathcal{D}(T)$ into $H^{-1}(T)$. □

Lemma 2.3. *We have*

$$\|u\|_{H^{-1}(T)} \lesssim \|Pu\|_{L^2} + |\langle u, 1\rangle|, \qquad u \in H^{-1}(T).$$

Proof. For all $u \in H^{-1}(T)$ we have by (2.3)

$$u = (Pu)' + \langle u, 1\rangle \delta_1 \quad \text{ in } H^{-1}(T).$$

Therefore, for $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, $\psi' \in \mathcal{D}(T)$ and has mean zero, and hence $J\psi'(x) = -\psi(x) + \psi(1)$. Accordingly, by (2.1)

$$\langle Pu, \psi'\rangle = -\langle u, \psi - \psi(1)\rangle = -\langle u, \psi\rangle + \psi(1)\langle u, 1\rangle,$$

or equivalently

$$\langle u, \psi\rangle = -\langle Pu, \psi'\rangle + \psi(1)\langle u, 1\rangle = \langle DPu, \psi\rangle + \psi(1)\langle u, 1\rangle.$$

That implies

$$|\langle u, \psi\rangle| \le |\langle Pu, \psi'\rangle| + |\psi(1)||\langle u, 1\rangle|.$$

By the Sobolev embedding theorem, we obtain

$$|\langle u, \psi\rangle| \lesssim (\|Pu\|_{L^2} + |\langle u, 1\rangle|) \|\psi\|_{H^1(T)}, \qquad \forall u \in H^{-1}(T),\ \psi \in \mathcal{D}(T),$$

that leads to the conclusion by density. □

Consider the spaces

$$V := \left\{ f \in L^2(0,1) : \mu_0(f) = \mu_1(f) = 0 \right\}$$

and

$$\tilde{V} := \left\{ f \in L^2(0,1) : \mu_0(f) = 0 \right\},$$

where for shortness we introduce the linear functionals

$$\mu_0(f) \quad := \quad \int_0^1 f(x)\,dx \qquad \text{and} \tag{2.6}$$

$$\mu_1(f) \quad := \quad \int_0^1 (1-x)f(x)\,dx = \int_0^1 \int_0^x f(z)dz\,dx \tag{2.7}$$

With this notation, (2.5) reads now

$$Pu(\cdot) = \mathcal{I}u(\cdot) - \mu_1(u), \qquad \forall u \in L^2(0,1), \tag{2.8}$$

and moreover

$$\mu_0(\mathcal{I}u) = \mu_1(u), \qquad \forall u \in L^2(0,1).$$

Observe that while μ_0 extends to a continuous functional on $H^{-1}(T)$, namely

$$\mu_0(f) := \langle f, 1 \rangle, \qquad f \in H^{-1}(T),$$

this is not possible for μ_1, as we are going to show in Lemma 2.11 below (although μ_1 is indeed continuous on $L^1(0,1)$).

For further purposes, we need to show that $H^{-1}(0,1) = (H_0^1(0,1))'$ is isomorphic to

$$H := \{ w \in H^{-1}(T) \,:\, \mu_0(w) = 0 \}.$$

For that purpose we define a mapping

$$\mathrm{Id} \,: H^{-1}(T) \ni w \mapsto \mathrm{Id}\, w \in H^{-1}(0,1),$$

where $\mathrm{Id}\, w$ is defined by

$$\langle \mathrm{Id}\, w, v \rangle_{H^{-1}(0,1)-H_0^1(0,1)} := \langle w, v \rangle_{H^{-1}(T)-H^1(T)}, \qquad \forall v \in H_0^1(0,1).$$

Denote its restriction to the space H of mean-zero $H^{-1}(T)$-functionals by Id_m, namely

$$\mathrm{Id}_m : H \ni w \mapsto \mathrm{Id}\, w \in H^{-1}(0,1).$$

We have already anticipated that $H^{-1}(T)$ is not a subspace of $H^{-1}(0,1)$, and in fact the identification operator Id cannot be seen as the canonical injection. The reason is explained in the following.

Lemma 2.4. *The linear and continuous mapping* Id *is not injective, since*

$$\ker \mathrm{Id} \;=\; \mathit{Span}\, \{\delta_1\}.$$

However, Id_m *is an isomorphism.*

Proof. $w \in \ker \mathrm{Id}$ if and only if

$$\langle w, v_1 \rangle_{H^{-1}(T)-H^1(T)} = 0, \qquad \forall v_1 \in H_0^1(0,1).$$

But for an arbitrary element v in $H^1(T)$, we have

$$v_1 := v - v(1) \in H_0^1(0,1).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w, v \rangle_{H^{-1}(T)-H^1(T)} &= \langle w, v_1 \rangle_{H^{-1}(T)-H^1(T)} + v(1)\mu_0(w) \\ &= v(1)\mu_0(w), \end{aligned}$$

which means that w is a multiple of δ_1, or more precisely

$$w = \mu_0(w)\delta_1.$$

From this identity, Id_m is clearly injective. But it is also surjective because given $w_1 \in H^{-1}(0,1)$, we can define $w \in H^{-1}(T)$ by

$$\langle w, v \rangle_{H^{-1}(T)-H^1(T)} = \langle w_1, v - v(0) \rangle_{H^{-1}(0,1)-H_0^1(0,1)}, \qquad \forall v \in H^1(T).$$

Now, $w \in H$ because $\mu_0(w) = 0$, and since

$$\mathrm{Id}_m w = w_1$$

the surjectivity follows. $\square$

Lemma 2.5. *For all $f \in H^1(0,1)$ and any $c \in \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$P(\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') + c\delta_1) = f' - f(1) + f(0)$$

as an equality of L^2-functions.

Proof. For shortness we write $g := \mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'')$. Observe that g is well defined because $f'' \in H^{-1}(0,1)$. By (2.3) we have

$$(Pg)' = g \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(T).$$

By the definition of Id_m we have

$$f'' = g \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0,1),$$

and we deduce that

$$(f' - Pg)' = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0,1).$$

Hence there exists a constant $a \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$f' - Pg = a \quad \text{in } L^2(0,1).$$

The conclusion follows from (2.2) and (2.4). $\square$

Remark 2.6. *Note that for $f \in H^2(0,1)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') = f'' + (f'(0) - f'(1))\delta_1 \quad \text{in } H^{-1}(T), \tag{2.9}$$

and therefore

$$P(\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'')) = P(f'') \quad \text{in } L^2(0,1).$$

This will be valuable information in the following, since it shows that, for functions regular enough, the annoying term $\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}u''$ can be safely replaced by u''.

(More generally, the same holds for $f \in H^s(0,1)$ for all $s > \frac{3}{2}$, since then $f'' \in H^{s-2}(0,1)$ and we can exploit the fact that $1 \in H_0^r(0,1)$ for all $r < \frac{1}{2}$ – as in fact $H_0^r(0,1) = H^r(T)$).

In the same spirit, we have the next equivalence.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $f \in H^1(0,1)$. Then $\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'')$ belongs to $L^2(0,1)$ if and only if $f \in H^2(0,1)$ and $f'(0) = f'(1)$.*

Proof. The necessity directly follows from (2.9). For the sufficiency we notice that

$$f'' = \mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0,1).$$

But by assumption the right-hand side of this identity belongs to $L^2(0,1)$, and therefore f belongs to $H^2(0,1)$. By (2.9), we get that $(f'(0) - f'(1))\delta_1$ has to belong to $L^2(0,1)$, that is only possible if $f'(0) - f'(1) = 0$. $\square$

By Lemma 2.3 the sesquilinear form defined by

$$(f,g) \mapsto \int_0^1 Pf(x)P\bar{g}(x)dx, \qquad f,g \in H, \tag{2.10}$$

is an equivalent inner product on H. For this reason, we will always endow H with the inner product

$$(\cdot|\cdot)_H := (P\cdot|P\cdot)_{L^2}$$

introduced in (2.10). We obtain the following characterization of the completion of V (and hence of $\tilde{V}$, too) with respect to this inner product.

Corollary 2.8. *The space V is dense in $H = \{f \in H^{-1}(T) : \mu_0(f) = 0\}$.*

Proof. Define $\tilde{H}$ as the closure of V in H.

The space $\tilde{H}$ is therefore a closed subspace of $H^{-1}(T)$, hence a Hilbert space for the norm of $H^{-1}(T)$. By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 we clearly have

$$\|u\|_{H^{-1}(T)} \simeq \|Pu\|_{L^2}, \qquad \forall u \in V.$$

Therefore the continuous embedding $\tilde{H} \hookrightarrow H$ holds and this equivalence remains valid on $\tilde{H}$ by density.

To prove the converse inclusion, we show that any $f \in H$ that is orthogonal to $\tilde{H}$ for the inner product $(\cdot|\cdot)_H$ is identically zero. In fact, let $f \in H$ be orthogonal to $\tilde{H}$. Then it satisfies in particular

$$(Pf|Pg)_{L^2} = 0, \qquad \forall g \in V,$$

and by (2.1) we get equivalently

$$\langle f, JPg\rangle = 0, \qquad \forall g \in V. \tag{2.11}$$

Now define

$$W := \{u \in H^1(T) \cap H^2(0,1) : u'(0) = u'(1) = 0\}. \tag{2.12}$$

This space is dense in $H^1(T)$: To see this, observe that $u - u(0) \in H_0^1(0,1)$ for all $u \in H^1(T)$, and hence for all $u \in H^1(T)$ there exists a sequence of $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{D}(0,1)$ such that

$$\varphi_n \to u - u(0) \qquad \text{in } H_0^1(0,1),$$

and therefore $\varphi_n + u(0) \in W$ with

$$\varphi_n + u(0) \to u \qquad \text{in } H^1(T).$$

Now for $h \in W$, we take $g = -h''$ that belongs to V due to the assumptions on h and by construction

$$JPg(x) = h(x) - h(1), \qquad \forall x \in (0,1).$$

Plugging this identity in (2.11) yields

$$\langle f, h - h(1)\rangle = 0, \qquad \forall h \in W. \tag{2.13}$$

But due to the fact that $\mu_0(f) = 0$, we deduce that

$$\langle f, h\rangle = 0, \qquad \forall h \in W.$$

As W is dense in $H^1(T)$, we conclude that $f = 0$. □

Remark 2.9. *The space $H^1(T)$ is the appropriate choice to discuss heat or wave equations equipped with* (1.1)*, since from our previous considerations the chosen space should contain $H_0^1(0,1)$ as well as the constant functions. In the proof of Corollary 2.8 we have shown that this space is exactly $H^1(T)$.*

Remark 2.10. *Let us summarize some obvious but useful properties of the linear operators J and P.*

1. *Let $f \in \tilde{V}$. Then*

$$Jf(x) = \int_x^1 f(y)dy, \qquad \forall x \in (0,1).$$

2. *Let $f \in L^2(0,1)$. Then for its primitive Pf we have by Lemma 2.2*

$$Pf \in H^1(0,1) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (Pf)' = f.$$

   More generally, by density

$$(Pf)' = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0,1), \qquad \forall f \in H^{-1}(T).$$

3. *Let $f \in L^2(0,1)$. Since apparently*

$$Pf(0) = -\mu_1(f) \qquad \text{and} \qquad Pf(1) = \mu_0(f) - \mu_1(f),$$

   we conclude that $Pf \in H^1(T)$ if $f \in \tilde{V}$, and in particular $Pf = \mathcal{I}f \in H_0^1(0,1)$ if $f \in V$.

4. *If instead $f \in H^1(0,1)$, we see that $Pf' = f - \int_0^1 f(x)dx$, hence in particular $Pf' = f$ for all $f \in H^1(0,1)$ with zero mean, hence by density also*

$$Pf' = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0,1), \qquad \forall f \in H.$$

(5) *Let* $f \in H^2(0,1)$*, then by Lemma 2.2* $P(f'')(x) = \int_0^x f''(y)dy - \int_0^1 \int_0^x f''(y)dydx = f'(x) - f(1) + f(0)$*, and by Lemma 2.5, this property remains valid on* $H^1(0,1)$ *if we replace* f'' *by* $\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1} f''$*:*

$$P(\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'')) = f' - f(1) + f(0) \quad \text{in } L^2(0,1).$$

(6) *By (2.2),* P *is a bounded linear operator from* $H^{-1}(T)$ *to* $\tilde{V}$ *and, by (3), also from* $\tilde{V}$ *to* $H^1(T)$ *as well as from* V *to* $H_0^1(0,1)$*.*

(7) *Finally, for all* $g \in V$ *we have* $Pg(x) = \int_0^x g(t)dt = \int_0^1 g(t)dt - \int_x^1 g(t)dt = -\int_x^1 g(t)dt$*. By (1)*

$$(JPg)(x) = -\int_x^1 \int_y^1 g(z)\, dzdy, \qquad \forall x \in (0,1).$$

From this identity and by density we see that

$$(JPg)'' = -g \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0,1), \qquad \forall g \in H.$$

Lemma 2.11. *The functional* $\mu_1 : L^2(0,1) \to \mathbb{C}$ *cannot be continuously extended to the whole of* $H^{-1}(T)$*.*

Proof. Would μ_1 be a continuous functional on $H^{-1}(T)$, then its restriction to H would be continuous on H as well. But then its null space $K \subset H$ would be closed in H. Since V is a subset of K and V is dense in H by Corollary 2.8, we would then obtain $K = H$ – which is false, because e.g. $u(x) := 2x - 1$ defines an element of H such that $\mu_1(u) \neq 0$. □

Nevertheless one can prove a weaker continuity property that will be crucial later on, whenever we discuss a wave-type equation.

Lemma 2.12. *There exists* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$|\mu_1(g)|^2 \leq C\|g\|_{L^2}\|g\|_{H^{-1}(T)}, \qquad \forall g \in L^2(0,1). \tag{2.14}$$

Proof. The following trace inequality is standard (see for instance [10, comment 1.(iii) at p. 233]): for all $u \in H^1(0,1)$

$$|u(1)|^2 \leq 2\sqrt{2}\|u\|_{L^2}\|u\|_{H^1(0,1)}. \tag{2.15}$$

Now for $g \in L^2(0,1)$, by Lemma 2.2 we know that Pg belongs to $H^1(0,1)$ and therefore applying (2.15) to Pg, we get

$$|(Pg)(1)|^2 \leq 2\sqrt{2}\|Pg\|_{L^2}\|Pg\|_{H^1(0,1)}.$$

Now, as Lemma 2.2 shows that $(Pg)' = g$, we have

$$\|Pg\|^2_{H^1(0,1)} = \|Pg\|^2_{L^2} + \|g\|^2_{L^2}.$$

Moreover Pg being given by (2.5), by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Pg\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\mathcal{I}g\|_{L^2} + \left|\int_0^1 \left(\int_0^x g(y)dy\right) dx\right| \\ &\leq 2\|\mathcal{I}g\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\|g\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence again owing to Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$|(Pg)(1)|^2 \leq C\|g\|_{H^{-1}(T)}\|g\|_{L^2}, \qquad \forall g \in L^2(0,1),$$

for some $C > 0$. Since

$$\mu_1(g) = \mu_0(g) - (Pg)(1),$$

and because

$$|\mu_0(g)| \leq \|g\|_{H^{-1}(T)} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2},$$

we can conclude that (2.14) holds. □

In view of Lemma 2.3 we see that

$$(f,g) \mapsto (Pf|Pg)_{L^2} + \mu_0(f)\mu_0(\bar{g}), \tag{2.16}$$

defines an inner product in $H^{-1}(T)$ whose associated norm is equivalent to the standard norm of $H^{-1}(T)$. We will stick to this inner product on $H^{-1}(T)$ throughout this article, and in particular we denote

$$\|f\|^2_{H^{-1}(T)} := \|f\|^2_{H_1} = \|Pf\|^2_{L^2} + \mu_0(f)\mu_0(\bar{f}).$$

We will repeatedly make use of the following integration-by-parts-type formula.

Lemma 2.13. *Let $u \in H^1(0,1)$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $h \in L^2(0,1)$. Then*

$$(\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(u'') + c\delta_1|h)_{H^{-1}(T)} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} c + u(1) \\ u(0) - u(1) \end{pmatrix} \Big| \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(h) \\ \mu_1(h) \end{pmatrix} \right)_{\mathbb{C}^2} - (u|h)_{L^2}.$$

Proof. Set $g = \mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(u'') + c\delta_1$, then by Lemma 2.5 we have

$$P(g) = u' - a,$$

where $a := u(1) - u(0)$. Accordingly,

$$(Pg|Ph)_{L^2} = \int_0^1 (u'(x) - a)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx = \int_0^1 u'(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx,$$

since Ph has mean zero by Remark 2.10.(6). Integration by parts yields

$$(Pg|Ph)_{L^2} = -\int_0^1 u(x)\overline{(Ph)'}(x)dx + [u(P\bar{h})]_0^1.$$

By Remark 2.10.(2)–(3) we deduce that

$$(Pg|Ph)_{L^2} = -\int_0^1 u(x)\overline{h(x)}dx + u(1)\mu_0(\bar{h}) + (u(0) - u(1))\mu_1(\bar{h}).$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} -(g|h)_{H_1} &= -(Pg|Ph)_{L^2} - \mu_0(g)\mu_0(\bar{h}) \\ &= \int_0^1 u(x)\bar{h}(x)dx - (c + u(1))\mu_0(\bar{h}) + (u(1) - u(0))\mu_1(\bar{h}), \end{aligned}$$

as we wanted to prove. ☐

Remark 2.14. *Because by* (2.8)

$$(f|g)_H = \int_0^1 \mathcal{I}f(x)\mathcal{I}\bar{g}(x)dx, \qquad \forall f,g \in V,$$

our Hilbert space $(H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ agrees with the space denoted by B_2^1 and termed the Bouziani space *in* [6] *and some subsequent papers by Bouziani himself and other authors.*

3. Well-posedness in the space of zero mean functions

In this section we propose a general Hilbert space setting in order to study both the heat and the wave equations under (generalizations of) the integral constraints

$$\int_0^1 u(x)\,dx = \int_0^1 xu(x)\,dx = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Namely, we take the spaces $V, \tilde{V}$ equipped with the L^2-inner product and the space H with the $(\cdot|\cdot)_H$-inner product defined in (2.10).

We further let $k \in \mathbb{C}$ and consider the sesquilinear form a_k defined by

$$a_k(f,g) := \int_0^1 f(x)\bar{g}(x)\,dx + k\mu_1(f)\mu_1(\bar{g}), \tag{3.2}$$

with form domain either V or $\tilde{V}$. Since V is dense in H, the form a_k with domain V or $\tilde{V}$ is associated with a linear operator $(A_k, D(A_k))$ or $(A_k, \widetilde{D}(A_k))$, respectively, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} D(A_k) &:= \left\{ f \in V : \exists g \in H : a_k(f,h) = \int_0^1 (Pg)(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx \ \ \forall h \in V \right\}, \\ \widetilde{D}(A_k) &:= \left\{ f \in \tilde{V} : \exists g \in H : a_k(f,h) = \int_0^1 (Pg)(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx \ \ \forall h \in \tilde{V} \right\}, \\ A_k f &:= g. \end{aligned}$$

(In the former case, the second term on the right hand side of (3.2) vanishes and hence $(A_k, D(A_k))$ does not really depend on k. This is why in the following we denote it simply by $(A, D(A))$).

Theorem 3.1. *The operator $(A, D(A))$ associated with (a_0, V) is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} D(A) &= \{u \in H^1(0,1) : \mu_0(u) = \mu_1(u) = 0\} \\ Au &= -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(u''). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that in particular

$$Au = -u'' \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0,1).$$

Proof. Denote

$$\mathcal{K} := \{u \in H^1(0,1) : \mu_0(u) = \mu_1(u) = 0\}.$$

Let us first show the inclusion $D(A) \subset \mathcal{K}$. Let $f \in D(A)$. Then there exists $g \in H^{-1}(T)$ for which $\mu_0(g) = 0$ (i.e., $g \in H$) and such that

$$a_k(f,h) = (f|h)_{L^2} = \int_0^1 (Pg)(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx, \qquad \forall h \in V.$$

Now for $g \in H^{-1}(T)$ we see that $P(Pg)$ belongs to $H^1(0,1)$, by applying Lemma 2.2 twice. Taking into account Remark 2.10.(2), by integration by parts we obtain for all $h \in V$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 (Pg)(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx &= \int_0^1 (P(Pg))'(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx \\ &= -\int_0^1 (P(Pg))(x)\overline{(Ph)'}(x)\,dx \\ &= -\int_0^1 (P(Pg))(x)\bar{h}(x)\,dx, \end{aligned}$$

where in order to get rid of the boundary terms we have used the fact that, by Remark 2.10.(3), $Ph \in H_0^1(0,1)$. This shows that

$$(f|h)_{L^2} = -(P(Pg)|h)_{L^2}, \qquad \forall h \in V.$$

In other words if we denote by Π the orthogonal projection of $L^2(0,1)$ onto the vector space $\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{R})$ (i.e., onto the space of polynomials of one real variable with complex coefficients and degree ≤ 1), we have

$$f = -(Id - \Pi)P(Pg) = -P(Pg) + \Pi P(Pg).$$

We deduce that f belongs to $H^1(0,1)$ because $\Pi P(Pg)$ is a polynomial of degree ≤ 1. This also yields that $g = -f''$ in $\mathcal{D}'(0,1)$, so that $Af = g = \mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'')$ (reminding that g is of zero mean).

Let us now prove the converse inclusion. Let $f \in \mathcal{K}$. Then we can take $g := -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') \in H$. Applying Lemma 2.13 we obtain

$$(g|h)_H = (f|h)_{L^2}, \qquad \forall h \in V.$$

This shows that $f \in D(A)$ and concludes the proof. ☐

Remark 3.2. *Contrary to the intuition, for $u \in D(A) \subset H^1(0,1)$ the vector Au does not agree with $-u''$ even if u'' belongs to $H^{-1}(T)$. Indeed take the function u defined by*

$$u(x) = |x - \frac{1}{2}| + \alpha x + \beta,$$

with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed such that $\mu_0(u) = \mu_1(u) = 0$. Hence we easily check that

$$-u'' = 2\delta_{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad \text{in } H^{-1}(0,1),$$

that can be considered as an element of $H^{-1}(T)$. The distribution $-u''$ cannot agree with Au since $\mu_0(u'') = 2\mu_0(\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}) = 2$. In fact

$$Au = -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(u'') = 2(\delta_{\frac{1}{2}} - \delta_1),$$

and elementary calculations confirm that

$$a(u,h) = \int_0^1 u(x)h(x)\,dx = \int_0^1 P(Au)(x)Ph(x)\,dx, \quad \forall h \in V.$$

Similarly, we have the following. We omit the proof, which can be performed just like that of Theorem 4.3 below.

Theorem 3.3. *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{D}(A_k) &= \{u \in H^1(0,1) : \mu_0(u) = 0,\ u(1) - u(0) = k\mu_1(u)\} \\ A_k u &= -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(u''). \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 3.4. *The following assertions concerning the form defined in* (3.2) *hold with respect to the space H.*

1. *The form a with domain V is densely defined, symmetric, continuous and coercive. Hence, the associated operator $(A, D(A))$ is self-adjoint and semi-bounded on H. In particular, $(A, D(A))$ generates a cosine operator function with associated phase space $V \times H$ and hence an exponentially stable, contractive, analytic semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t\geq 0}$ of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ on H. This semigroup is immediately of trace class.*
2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{C}$. Then the form a_k with domain $\tilde{V}$ is densely defined, continuous, elliptic and it satisfies the Crouzeix estimate. It is coercive (resp., accretive) if $\operatorname{Re} k > 0$ (resp., $\operatorname{Re} k \geq 0$). It is symmetric if and only if $k \in \mathbb{R}$. The associated operator $(A_k, \widetilde{D}(A_k))$ generates a cosine operator function with associated phase space $\tilde{V} \times H$ and hence an analytic semigroup $(e^{-tA_k})_{t\geq 0}$ of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ on H. This semigroup is immediately of trace class. It is contractive if $\operatorname{Re} k \geq 0$ and exponentially stable if $\operatorname{Re} k > 0$.*

Before proving the above result we recall that, in accordance with the terminology of [30, 1], a sesquilinear form $a : V \times V \to \mathbb{C}$ is called *H-elliptic* (or simply *elliptic*) if there exist $\alpha > 0$ and $\omega \geq 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{Re} a(f,f) + \omega\|f\|_H^2 \geq \alpha\|f\|_V^2, \qquad \forall f \in V;$$

it is called *coercive* if it is elliptic with $\omega = 0$; and finally it is called *accretive* if

$$\operatorname{Re} a(f,f) \geq 0, \qquad \forall f \in V.$$

We also say that it satisfies the *Crouzeix estimate* if for some $M > 0$

$$|\operatorname{Im} a(f,f)| \leq M\|f\|_V\|f\|_H, \qquad \forall f \in V.$$

(The name is due to the fact that forms that satisfy the Crouzeix estimate also fit the framework of [15]).

Proof. The properties of the form a in (1) are apparent and hence the associated operator $(A, D(A))$ is self-adjoint and strictly positive. Hence, by the spectral theorem $(A, D(A))$ generates a cosine operator function with associated phase space $V \times H$ and an analytic semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t\geq 0}$ of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ on H. Due to the trace class embedding of $H^1(0,1)$ in $L^2(0,1)$ (cf. [26]), these semigroups are in fact even immediately of trace class.

Let us now focus on the case in (2). By Lemma 2.12 and a standard application of Young's inequality we can easily deduce ellipticity of a_k. Furthermore, using Lemma 2.12 it directly follows that [15, Thm. 5] applies and we deduce that $(A_k, \widetilde{D}(A_k))$ generates a cosine operator function with phase space $\tilde{V} \times H$ for any $k \in \mathbb{C}$, hence an analytic semigroup of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ by [3, Thm. 3.14.17]. By the above mentioned trace class embedding of $H^1(0,1)$ in $L^2(0,1)$, the semigroup generated by $(A_k, \widetilde{D}(A_k))$ is immediately of trace class for any $k \in \mathbb{C}$. ☐

In fact, it is well-known that any operator A associated with an elliptic form $a : V \times V \to \mathbb{C}$ is associated with three semigroups, cf. [2, Chapter 7]: one on the given Hilbert space, one on the form domain and one on the dual of the form domain (using the given Hilbert space as the pivot space). It is also known (see e.g. [1, § 5.5.2]) that if a is symmetric (and hence the associated operator A is self-adjoint), then A is similar to A^V (the part of A in the form domain). The operator on the form domain is then described in the following, whose proof is obvious due to the above mentioned similarity, Lemma 2.7 and the fact that

$$\mu_0(u'') = u'(1) - u'(0) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu_1(u'') = u(1) - u(0) - u'(0), \qquad \forall u \in H^2(0,1).$$

Theorem 3.5. *Let $k \in \mathbb{R}$ in (3.2). Then the following assertions hold.*

(1) The semigroup generated on H by $(A, D(A))$ leaves V invariant and its restriction is a semigroup on V that is analytic of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ and immediately of trace class. Its generator is the part A^V of A in V: its domain is

$$D(A^V) = \{u \in H^2(0,1) : \mu_0(u) = \mu_1(u) = 0 \text{ and } u'(1) = u'(0) = u(1) - u(0)\}.$$

(2) The semigroup generated on H by $(A_k, \widetilde{D}(A_k))$ leaves $\tilde{V}$ invariant and its restriction is a semigroup on $\tilde{V}$ that is analytic of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ and immediately of trace class. Its generator is the part $A^{\tilde{V}}$ of A in $\tilde{V}$: its domain is

$$\widetilde{D}(A_k^{\tilde{V}}) = \{u \in H^2(0,1) : \mu_0(u) = 0,\ u'(1) = u'(0) \text{ and } u(1) - u(0) = k\mu_1(u)\}.$$

Remark 3.6. *The boundary conditions arising in Theorem 3.5 are not unusual. In the special case of $k = 0$, the operator $A_0^{\tilde{V}}$ is simply the second derivative with periodic boundary conditions with domain $H^2(T) \cap \tilde{V}$. Boundary conditions of this form have also been considered in several articles on so-called quantum graphs, see e.g.* [14, 19]. *In fact, the setting in the present article is related to quantum graphs in an interesting way: Whenever dealing with a Laplacian on a graph G, it is well-known (see e.g.* [4, 29]*) that the correct $L^2(G)$-variational formulation of the problem includes a Dirichlet form with domain $H^1(G)$ (the space of edge-wrise H^1-functions that are continuous in the nodes). As already mentioned, it follows from the general theory of forms that the associated operator (that is, the Laplacian) generates three semigroups: on $L^2(G)$ as well as on the form domain $H^1(G)$ and on its dual $H^{-1}(G)$. In the special case of a graph reducing to a single loop, $H^{-1}(G)$ is nothing but the space $H = H^{-1}(T)$ in the present paper.*

More explicitly, we obtain the following well-posedness result. It should be compared with the main result in [9], which our theorem below widely extends – in fact, both the allowed initial data are more general and the notion of solution is much stronger.

Theorem 3.7. *The heat equation*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t,x) = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,x), \qquad t > 0,\ x \in (0,1),$$

with moment conditions

$$\mu_0(u(t)) = \mu_1(u(t)) = 0, \qquad t \geq 0,$$

or

$$\mu_0(u(t)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u(t,1) - u(t,0) = k\mu_1(u(t)), \qquad t \geq 0,$$

(for any given $k \in \mathbb{C}$) and initial condition

$$u(0,\cdot) = u_0 \in \{f \in H^{-1}(T) : \mu_0(f) = 0\}$$

is governed by an analytic semigroup consisting of trace class operators, and in particular it is well-posed.[1] *In the former case, or in the latter case if additionally* $\operatorname{Re} k > 0$, *the semigroup is uniformly exponentially stable, and in particular*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|u(t,\cdot)\|_{H^{-1}(T)} = 0$$

uniformly for all initial data.

In the proof of this theorem we will need the following result.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $k \in \mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$D(A^2) = \{u \in H^3(0,1) : \mu_0(u) = \mu_0(u'') = \mu_1(u) = \mu_1(u'') = 0\}$$

and

$$D(A_k^2) = \{u \in H^3(0,1) : \mu_0(u) = \mu_0(u'') = 0, \mu_0(u') - k\mu_1(u) = \mu_0(u''') - k\mu_1(u'') = 0\}.$$

---

[1] I.e., it admits a unique mild solution for all admissible initial data. Analogous notions of well-posedness will be used in the following: we refer to [3, §3.1 and §3.14] for a precise definition of these notions in the heat and wave case, respectively.

Proof. The inclusion "$\supset$" is clear. To prove that "$\subset$" also holds, take $u \in H^1(0,1)$ such that $Au = -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1} u'' \in H^1(0,1)$. It clearly suffices to prove that $u'' \in H^1(0,1)$. Now,

$$\langle u'', v, \rangle_{H^{-1}(0,1)-H^1_0(0,1)} = \langle \mathrm{Id}_m^{-1} u'', v\rangle_{H-H^1(T)} = -\langle Au, v\rangle_{H-H^1(T)} \qquad \forall v \in \mathcal{D}(0,1).$$

Now, because by assumption $Au \in H^1(0,1)$ we deduce that in fact

$$\langle u'', v, \rangle_{H^{-1}(0,1)-H^1_0(0,1)} = -(Au|v)_{L^2},$$

hence $u'' = -Au \in H^1(0,1)$ and we conclude that $u \in H^3(0,1)$, as we wanted to prove. ☐

Proof of Theorem 3.7. Since the operators A and A_k are generators of analytic semigroups, well-posedness of the corresponding parabolic problem is clear. However, by construction these semigroups yield in fact the solution of the evolution equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t,x) = \mathrm{Id}\,_m^{-1} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,x), \qquad t \geq 0,\ x \in (0,1), \tag{3.3}$$

rather than the standard heat equation. However, by standard semigroup theory we know that $u(t) := e^{-tA}u_0$ and $u(t) := e^{-tA_k}u_0$ lies in $D(A^2)$ and $D(A_k^2)$, respectively, for any $t > 0$. Hence, by Remark 2.6 the claim will follow if we show that $D(A^2) \subset H^2(0,1)$ and $D(A_k^2) \subset H^2(0,1)$. But this is just the claim of Lemma 3.8. ☐

Similarly, the following holds.

Theorem 3.9. *The generalized wave equation*

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}(t,x) = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathrm{m}}^{-1} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,x), \qquad t \in \mathbb{R},\ x \in (0,1),$$

with moment conditions

$$\mu_0(u(t)) = \mu_1(u(t)) = 0, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

or

$$\mu_0(u(t)) = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad u(t,1) - u(t,0) = k\mu_1(u(t)), \qquad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and initial conditions

$$u(0,\cdot) = u_0 \in \{f \in L^2(0,1) : \mu_0(f) = \mu_1(f) = 0\}$$

or

$$u(0,\cdot) = u_0 \in \{f \in L^2(0,1) : \mu_0(f) = 0\}$$

along with (in either case)

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(0,\cdot) = u_1 \in \{f \in H^{-1}(T) : \mu_0(f) = 0\}$$

is governed by a cosine operator function, and in particular it is well-posed. The solution satisfies in fact the proper wave equation

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}(t,x) = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,x), \qquad t \in \mathbb{R},\ x \in (0,1),$$

if additionally the initial data u_0, u_1 *are in* $D(A^V)$ *or* $\widetilde{D}(A_k^{\tilde{V}})$ *and* $D(A)$ *or* $\widetilde{D}(A_k)$*, respectively.*

Proof. Since cosine functions keep the regularity of initial data but offer no additional smoothing effect, we are forced to reach $H^2(0,1)$-regularity of solutions (which by Remark 2.6 is sufficient to finally drop Id_m^{-1}) by actually imposing more regular data. This is obtained if u_0 lies in the domain of the generator's part in the form domain; and u_1 lies in the generator's domain, respectively. ☐

Remark 3.10. *Of course, the only positive-valued function with zero mean is the constant function of value 0. Therefore, the semigroup is trivially positivity preserving. It is more interesting to discuss invariance of other order intervals, and in particular that of the unit ball of* V *or* $\tilde{V}$ *with respect to the* L^∞*-norm. However, it is not clear how the orthogonal projections onto such balls look like, so that we are not able to apply* [30, Thm. 2.2]*; and on the other hand* [25, Thm. 2.1] *does not seemingly yield valuable information, since neither* V *nor* $\tilde{V}$ *are invariant under the orthogonal projection*

$$P : u \mapsto (|u| \wedge 1)\,\mathrm{sgn}\, u \tag{3.4}$$

of $L^2(0,1)$ *onto the* $\|\cdot\|_\infty$*-unit ball: simply think of the function*

$$u(x) = \mathbf{1}_{[0,\frac{3}{4}]}(x) - 3\cdot \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{3}{4},1]}(x) \quad \forall x \in [0,1].$$

Therefore, the question whether the semigroup extends to further $L^p(0,1) \cap V$-spaces remains open.

(If however one considers the operators introduced in Theorem 3.5 but drops the integral conditions and simply considers the (non-integral) non-local Robin-type ones, it has been shown in [5] *that the associated semigroup on $L^2(0,1)$ does in fact extend to all $L^p(0,1)$-spaces, $p \in [1,\infty]$, and even to $C[0,1]$).*

4. WELL-POSEDNESS IN THE SPACE OF NON-ZERO MEAN FUNCTIONS

We now consider the case where we impose some relationship between the moments and the boundary values of the unknown: More precisely we want to study the problem

$$-u_{xx}(x) = f(x), \qquad x \in (0,1),$$

with the condition

$$K \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(u) \\ \mu_1(u) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u'(0) - u'(1) - u(1) \\ u(1) - u(0) \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.1}$$

for some 2×2-matrix K (where μ_0, μ_1 are defined as in (2.6)-(2.7)), as well as generalizations of it. For shortness we introduce the linear maps $\Gamma_1 : L^2(0,1) \to \mathbb{C}^2$ and $\Gamma_2 : H^2(0,1) \to \mathbb{C}^2$, defined by

$$\Gamma_1 u := \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(u) \\ \mu_1(u) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \Gamma_2 u := \begin{pmatrix} -\mu_0(u'') - u(1) \\ u(1) - u(0) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.2}$$

so that (4.1) can be reformulated as

$$K\Gamma_1 u = \Gamma_2 u.$$

The above elliptic problem is still well-posed for $f \in L^2(0,1)$, if the matrix K that appears in (4.1) is well chosen.

We emphasize that the conditions treated in the previous section are *not* a special case of those in (4.1): however, the conditions considered in both the previous section and in (4.1) can be described in a unified formalism, as we show next.

Again, we wish to use a standard Hilbert setting. We define

$$V_Y := \{f \in L^2(0,1) : (\mu_0(f), \mu_1(f)) \in Y\},$$

for arbitrary subspaces Y of $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Remark 4.1. *Observe that the compact mapping*

$$\Gamma_1 := \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0 \\ \mu_1 \end{pmatrix} : L^2(0,1) \to \mathbb{C}^2$$

is surjective. In particular, for any given subspace Y of $\mathbb{C}^2$ there exists $u \in V_Y$.

In fact, given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, we look for u in the form $u(x) = \gamma x + \delta$, with $\gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\int_0^1 (\gamma x + \delta)\, dx = \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 (1-x)(\gamma x + \delta)\, dx = \beta.$$

This is equivalent to a 2×2 system of linear equations that has a unique solution. More generally, we can similarly show that for any subspace Y of $\mathbb{C}^2$ the mapping

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_Y \Gamma_1 \\ P_{Y^\perp} \Gamma_2 \end{pmatrix} : H^2(0,1) \to \mathbb{C}^2$$

is surjective as well.

We assume throughout this section that $Y \neq \{0\}^2$ and $Y \neq \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$ (since with these both choices, V_Y would agree with the spaces $V, \tilde{V}$ that have already been studied in Section 3: more precisely, $V = V_{\{0\}^2}$ and $\tilde{V} = V_{\{0\}\times\mathbb{C}}$). We then take

$$V_Y \hookrightarrow H_1 := H^{-1}(T)$$

equipped with the $L^2(0,1)$-inner product and the inner product defined in (2.16), respectively.

We first show that V_Y is indeed dense in H_1.

Theorem 4.2. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $Y \neq \{0\}^2$ and $Y \neq \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$. Then V_Y is dense in H_1.*

Before proving this assertion, let us observe that under the assumptions of Theorem 4.2, either $Y = \mathbb{C}^2$ or there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ such that Y is the set of all $(z_0, z_1) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ satisfying

$$z_1 = \alpha z_0. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let us first assume that $Y \neq \mathbb{C}^2$ and let $f \in H^{-1}(T)$ be such that

$$(f|g)_{H_1} = 0, \qquad \forall g \in V_Y. \tag{4.4}$$

Since for the space V introduced in Section 3 there holds $V \subset V_Y$, this implies that

$$(f|g)_{H_1} = 0, \qquad \forall g \in V,$$

and reasoning as in the proof of Corollary 2.8 we deduce that (2.13) holds for the space W defined in (2.12). Since W is dense in $H^1(T)$, this is equivalent to

$$\langle f, h - h(1) \rangle = 0, \qquad \forall h \in H^1(T),$$

or again

$$f = \mu_0(f)\delta_1 \quad \text{in } H^{-1}(T). \tag{4.5}$$

Coming back to (4.4) we get

$$0 = \mu_0(f)\left((P\delta_1|Pg)_{L^2} + \mu_0(\delta_1)\mu_0(\bar{g})\right) = \mu_0(f)\mu_0(\bar{g}), \qquad \forall g \in V_Y, \tag{4.6}$$

because by (2.1), $P\delta_1 = 0$. Now, Remark 4.1 guarantees the existence of an element $g \in L^2(0,1)$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(g) \\ \mu_1(g) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix},$$

where α is as in (4.3). Hence, we can plug such a $g \in V_Y$ in (4.6) and we find $\mu_0(f) = 0$, hence, by (4.5), $f = 0$. This shows that V_Y is dense in H_1 if $Y \neq \mathbb{C}^2$. For the case $Y = \mathbb{C}^2$, $V_Y = L^2(0,1)$ and the density is immediate. ☐

We further take

$$a_K(f,g) := (f|g)_{L^2} + (K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 g)_{\mathbb{C}^2}, \qquad f, g \in V_Y, \tag{4.7}$$

i.e.,

$$a_K(f,g) = \int_0^1 f(x)\bar{g}(x)\,dx + (\mu_0(f) \;\; \mu_1(f))K^* \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(\bar{g}) \\ \mu_1(\bar{g}) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \forall f, g \in V_Y,$$

where K is an arbitrary 2×2-matrix with complex entries.

Like in the previous section we have the following characterization of the operator $(A_{Y,K}, D(A_{Y,K}))$ associated with the form a_K with domain V_Y.

Theorem 4.3. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $Y \neq \{0\}^2$ and $Y \neq \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$ and let K be an arbitrary 2×2-matrix. One has*

$$\begin{aligned} D(A_{Y,K}) &= \left\{ u \in H^1(0,1) : \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(u) \\ \mu_1(u) \end{pmatrix} \in Y \right\} \\ A_{Y,K}u &= -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(u'') - c(u)\delta_1, \end{aligned}$$

with $c(u) \in \mathbb{C}$ uniquely determined by the condition

$$K \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(u) \\ \mu_1(u) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} c(u) + u(1) \\ u(0) - u(1) \end{pmatrix} \in Y^\perp. \tag{4.8}$$

Observe that this agrees with the results in Theorems 3.1 and 3.3.

Proof. We denote

$$\mathcal{K}_1 := \left\{ u \in H^1(0,1) : \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(u) \\ \mu_1(u) \end{pmatrix} \in Y \right\}$$

and proceed as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in order to characterize $A_{Y,K}$, which by definition is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D(A_{Y,K}) &:= \{ f \in V_Y : \exists g \in H_1 : a_K(f,h) = (g|h)_{H_1} \; \forall h \in V_Y \}, \\ A_{Y,K}f &:= g. \end{aligned}$$

Let us first check the inclusion $D(A_{Y,K}) \subset \mathcal{K}_1$. Let $f \in D(A_{Y,K})$. Then $f \in V_Y$ and there exists $g \in H^{-1}(T)$ such that

$$(f|h)_{L^2} + (K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} = \int_0^1 (Pg)(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\, dx + \mu_0(g)\mu_0(\bar{h}), \qquad \forall h \in V_Y. \tag{4.9}$$

Now, because $g \in H^{-1}(T)$, by Remark 2.10.(6) we can consider $P(Pg)$ that belongs to $H^1(T)$. Therefore by integration by parts we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 (Pg)(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\, dx &= \int_0^1 (P(Pg))'(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\, dx \\ &= -\int_0^1 (P(Pg))(x)\bar{h}(x)\, dx + [P(Pg)(P\bar{h})]_0^1, \qquad \forall h \in V_Y.\end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that the scalar number

$$-(K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} + \mu_0(g)\mu_0(\bar{h}) + [P(Pg)(P\bar{h})]_0^1 \in \mathbb{C}$$

is a linear combination of $\mu_0(\bar{h})$ and $\mu_1(\bar{h})$, hence it can be written in the form

$$c_0\mu_0(\bar{h}) + c_1\mu_1(\bar{h}) = \int_0^1 (c_0 + c_1(1-x))\overline{h(x)} dx,$$

for some $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{C}$. Letting $p(x) := c_0 + c_1(1-x)$, we obtain that

$$(f|h)_{L^2} = (-P(Pg) + p|h)_{L^2}, \qquad \forall h \in V_Y,$$

where p is a polynomial of degree ≤ 1. Therefore, denoting by Π as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 the orthogonal projection of $L^2(0,1)$ onto the vector space $\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{R})$, we obtain (by restricting the previous identity to all $h \in V \subset V_Y$)

$$(I - \Pi)(f + P(Pg) - p) = 0,$$

or equivalently

$$f = (I - \Pi)(-P(Pg) + p) = -P(Pg) + \Pi(P(Pg) + f). \tag{4.10}$$

This proves that f belongs to $H^1(0,1)$ and (differentiating (4.10) twice) that $g = -f''$ in the distributional sense (i.e. in $\mathcal{D}'(0,1)$). Hence, by Lemma 2.4, there exists $c(f) \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$A_{Y,K} f = g = -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') - c\delta_1,$$

and in fact $c(f) = -\mu_0(g)$.

It remains to check the condition

$$K\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(f)\\ \mu_1(f)\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix}c(f) + f(1)\\ f(0) - f(1)\end{pmatrix} \in Y^\perp. \tag{4.11}$$

We first notice that, for all $f \in D(A_{Y,K})$, (4.10) leads to

$$f' = -Pg + a,$$

for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$. By (4.9) we obtain

$$\int_0^1 f(x)\bar{h}(x)\, dx + (K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} = \int_0^1 (-f'(x) + a)(P\bar{h})(x)\, dx - c(f)\mu_0(\bar{h}), \qquad \forall h \in V_Y.$$

As $a\int_0^1 (Ph)(x)\, dx = 0$ because $Ph \in \tilde{V}$ by Remark 2.10.(6), we deduce that

$$\int_0^1 f(x)\bar{h}(x)\, dx + (K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} = -\int_0^1 f'(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\, dx - c(f)\mu_0(\bar{h}), \qquad \forall h \in V_Y.$$

By integration by parts in the first term on the right-hand side we obtain (since $(Ph)' = h$ by Remark 2.10.(2))

$$(K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} = f(0)(P\bar{h})(0) - f(1)(P\bar{h})(1) - c(f)\mu_0(\bar{h}), \qquad \forall h \in V_Y.$$

By Remark 2.10.(3) we arrive at

$$(K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} = (-c(f) - f(1))\mu_0(\bar{h}) + (f(1) - f(0))\mu_1(\bar{h}), \quad \forall h \in V_Y.$$

By surjectivity of Γ_1, cf. Remark 4.1, we have shown (4.11).

Before going on let us notice that (4.11) determines in a unique way c. Indeed in the case $Y=\mathbb{C}^2$, then this condition is equivalent to

$$K\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(f)\\ \mu_1(f)\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}c(f)+f(1)\\ f(0)-f(1)\end{pmatrix}=0,$$

while in the case $Y=\text{Span }(1,\alpha)^\top$ with $\alpha\in\mathbb{C}$, then (4.11) is equivalent to

$$\left(K\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(f)\\ \mu_1(f)\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}c(f)+f(1)\\ f(0)-f(1)\end{pmatrix}\Bigm|\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \alpha\end{pmatrix}\right)_{\mathbb{C}^2}=0,$$

which again determines c uniquely.

Let us now prove the converse inclusion. Let then $f\in\mathcal{K}_1$. Then we can take $g=-\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'')-c\delta_1$, with $c\in\mathbb{C}$ fixed by the condition (4.11). Moreover by Lemma 2.13, for all $h\in L^2(0,1)$ we may write

$$(g|h)_{H^{-1}(T)}=-\left(\begin{pmatrix}c(f)+f(1)\\ f(0)-f(1)\end{pmatrix}\Bigm|\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(h)\\ \mu_1(h)\end{pmatrix}\right)_{\mathbb{C}^2}+(f|h)_{L^2}.$$

But taking $h\in V_Y$ and using (4.11) allow to transform the first term of this right-hand side and to obtain

$$(g|h)_{H^{-1}(T)}=\left(K\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(f)\\ \mu_1(f)\end{pmatrix}\Bigm|\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(h)\\ \mu_1(h)\end{pmatrix}\right)_{\mathbb{C}^2}+(f|h)_{L^2},\qquad\forall h\in V_Y.$$

This shows that

$$a_K(f,h)=(g|h)_{H^{-1}(T)},\qquad\forall h\in V_Y,$$

and proves that f belongs to $D(A_{Y,K})$. ☐

Remark 4.4. *Let $q\in C^1([0,1];\mathbb{C})$ with $0<q_0\le\operatorname{Re}q(x)\le Q_0$ for some $q_0,Q_0\in\mathbb{R}$ and all $x\in[0,1]$. Then one can consider the form defined by*

$$a_K(f,g):=(qf|g)_{L^2}+(K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 g)_{\mathbb{C}^2},\qquad f,g\in V_Y.$$

Mimicking the proof of Theorem 4.3, one can prove that the associated operator is given by

$$\begin{aligned}D(A_{Y,K})&=\left\{u\in H^1(0,1):\Gamma_1 u\in Y\right\},\\ A_{Y,K}u&=-\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(qu)''-c_q\delta_1,\end{aligned}$$

with $c_q\in\mathbb{C}$ uniquely determined by the condition

$$K\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u)\\ \mu_1(u)\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}c_q+q(1)u(1)\\ \mu_0((qu)')\end{pmatrix}\in Y^\perp.$$

Similar conclusions hold in the cases of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3 above and 6.4 below. We omit the straightforward details.

Because V_Y is densely and continuously embedded in H_1, the following holds.

Proposition 4.5. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $Y\neq\{0\}^2$ and $Y\neq\{0\}\times\mathbb{C}$. The densely defined form a_K with domain V_Y is bounded and elliptic and satisfies the Crouzeix condition. It is coercive (resp., accretive) if both eigenvalues of K have strictly positive (resp., positive) real part. It is symmetric if K is hermitian.*

Therefore, the operator $A_{Y,K}$ associated with the form generates a cosine operator function with phase space $V_Y\times H_1$ and hence an analytic semigroup $(e^{-tA_{Y,K}})_{t\ge0}$ of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ on H_1. This semigroup is immediately of trace class. It is contractive (resp., exponentially stable) if both eigenvalues of K have positive (resp., strictly positive) real part.

Proof. All properties of a_K are apparent, since they can be proved like in the proof of Corollary 3.4. In particular, generation of a cosine operator function follows from [1, § 5.6.6] (see also [15, Thm. 5]) because

$$|\mathrm{Im}\ a_K(u,u)|\le|(K\Gamma_1 u|\Gamma_1 u)_{\mathbb{C}^2}|\le M\|u\|_{V_Y}\|u\|_{H_1},\qquad\forall u\in V_Y,$$

where the inequality is a direct consequence of the boundedness of μ_0 on H_1 and Lemma 2.11. ☐

Again, we obtain the following concerning well-posedness in a more common L^2-context.

Theorem 4.6. *Let K be hermitian and Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Then the semigroup $(e^{-tA_{Y,K}})_{t\geq 0}$ on H_1 leaves V_Y invariant and its restriction is a semigroup on V_Y that is analytic of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ and immediately of trace class. Its generator is the part $A^{V_Y}_{Y,K}$ of $A_{Y,K}$ in V_Y, which is explicitly given by*

$$\begin{aligned} D(A^{V_Y}_{Y,K}) &= \left\{u\in D(A_{Y,K})\cap H^2(0,1) : K\Gamma_1(u)+\Gamma_2(u)\in Y^\perp,\ \Gamma_1(u'')\in Y\right\}, \\ A^{V,Y}_{Y,K}u &= -u''. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It suffices to observe that the part of $A_{Y,K}$ in V_Y has domain

$$D(A^{V_Y}_{Y,K}) := \{u\in D(A_{Y,K}) : A_{Y,K}u\in V_Y\}.$$

But according to Theorem 4.3, for $f\in D(A_{Y,K})$ we have

$$A_{Y,K}f = -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') - c\delta_1,$$

with $c\in\mathbb{C}$ fixed by the condition (4.11). Therefore

$$f'' = -A_{Y,K}f \in \mathcal{D}'(0,1),$$

and since the condition $A_{Y,K}f\in V_Y$ means in particular that

$$A_{Y,K}f\in L^2(0,1),$$

we deduce that f belongs to $H^2(0,1)$.

On the other hand, using (2.9) we get

$$-A_{Y,K}f = f'' + (f'(0)-f'(1)+c)\delta_1 \in L^2(0,1).$$

Consequently $f'(0)-f'(1)+c$ must be zero, i.e.,

$$c = f'(1)-f'(0) = \mu_0(f''),$$

and

$$A_{Y,K}f = -f'',$$

as an equality of L^2-functions. By (4.8) we find

$$K\Gamma_1(u)+\Gamma_2(u)\in Y^\perp.$$

This completes the proof. □

Remark 4.7. *Again, taking the part in V_Y of our operators with integral conditions one sometimes obtains very natural boundary conditions of local type. For example, letting $Y=\mathbb{C}^2$ and $K=0$, one obtains that the part $A^{V_{\mathbb{C}^2}}_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}$ of $A_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}$ in $V_{\mathbb{C}^2}=L^2(0,1)$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} D(A^{V_{\mathbb{C}^2}}_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}) &= \{u\in H^1(T) : \mu_0(u'')+u(1)=0 \textit{ and } u''\in L^2(0,1)\} \\ &= \{u\in H^2(0,1) : u'(1)-u'(0)+u(1)=0 \textit{ and } u(0)=u(1)\} \\ A^{V_{\mathbb{C}^2}}_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}u &= -u'' \end{aligned}$$

which is nothing but a usual Laplacian on a trivial metric graph – to be more precise, the Laplacian on a loop with continuity and generalized Kirchhoff-type boundary conditions. In this sense, heat and wave equations with integral boundary conditions turn out to be nothing but the correct extensions of the common heat and wave equations on metric graphs with (possibly non-local but) non-integral boundary conditions, if one is interested in proving well-posedness in a larger Sobolev space of negative order instead of in the usual L^2-space.

More explicitly, mimicking the proof of Theorem 3.7 we obtain the following.

Theorem 4.8. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$, $Y\neq\{0\}^2$ and $Y\neq\{0\}\times\mathbb{C}$, and let K be a 2×2-matrix with complex entries.*

(1) *Then the heat equation*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t,x)=\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,x),\qquad t>0,\ x\in(0,1), \tag{4.12}$$

with moment conditions

$$P_{Y^\perp}\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u(t))\\ \mu_1(u(t))\end{pmatrix}=0,\qquad t>0, \tag{4.13}$$

and

$$P_Y\left(K\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u(t))\\ \mu_1(u(t))\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u'')+u(1)\\ u(0)-u(1)\end{pmatrix}\right)=0,\qquad t>0, \tag{4.14}$$

(here P_Y and $P_{Y^\perp}$ denote the orthogonal projections of $\mathbb{C}^2$ onto Y and $Y^\perp$, respectively) and initial condition

$$u(0,\cdot)=u_0\in H^{-1}(T)$$

is governed by an analytic semigroup consisting of trace class operators, and in particular it is well-posed. If additionally K is positive definite, then

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\|u(t,\cdot)\|_{H^{-1}}=0$$

uniformly for all initial data.

(2) *Similarly, the wave equation*

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}(t,x)=\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,x),\qquad t\ge 0,\ x\in(0,1),$$

with moment conditions (4.13)-(4.14) *and initial conditions*

$$u(0,\cdot)=u_0\in D(A_{Y,K}^{V_Y})$$

along with

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(0,\cdot)=u_1\in D(A_{Y,K})$$

is governed by a cosine operator function, and in particular it is well-posed.

Remark 4.9. *While discussing parabolic problems, one of the main advantages of form methods is the possibility of easily characterising invariance of closed convex subsets of an L^2-state space under the semigroup that governs the problem, by virtue of the celebrated Beurling–Deny criteria (later generalised in* [30, § 2.1] *and* [25]*). For example, once it is known that the orthogonal projection P of $L^2(0,1)$ onto the L^∞-unit ball is given by* (3.4) *one can characterize invariance of this set – which in turns in many relevant cases allows one to apply the interpolation theorem of Riesz–Thorin and hence to deduce well-posedness in all L^p-spaces. In our case, this would amount to consider the part of $A_{Y,K}$ in an H, consider the associated form (whose form domain is simply $D(A_{Y,K})$) and apply the Beurling–Deny criteria. Unfortunately, in our setting this program cannot generally be performed. To see this, observe that even in the simple case of $K=0$ and $Y=\mathbb{C}^2$ it is possible to find functions (e.g., $u(x)=x^2-2x-2$, $x\in[0,1]$) that belong to $D(A_{\mathbb{C}^2,0})$ but such that $Pu\equiv -1$. Since however $\mu_0((Pu)'')=-1$ and $Pu(1)=-1$, we see that $Pu\notin D(A_{\mathbb{C}^2,0})$, hence the L^∞-unit ball is not invariant under $(e^{-tA_{Y,K}})_{t\ge 0}$.*

This of course does not exclude the possibility that $(e^{-tA_{Y,K}})_{t\ge0}$ still extends to $L^p(0,1)$-spaces for some $p\neq 2$.

A major features of our semigroup approach, in particular in comparison with the (somehow related) method based on a Galerkin scheme, lies in the possibility to deduce optimal regularity results for the parabolic problem. For example it is known that due to analyticity the semigroup operators $e^{-tA_{Y,K}}$ map H or H_1 into $D(A_{Y,K})$ for all Y and K for all $t>0$, hence in particular (at least for all $Y\neq\{0\}^2$ and $Y\neq\{0\}\times\mathbb{C}$) they map $L^1(0,1)$ into $L^\infty(0,1)$ and by the Dunford–Pettis theorem (see [1, § 7.3.1]) we deduce that the semigroup operators are integral operators associated with an L^∞-kernel (but observe that the lack of control on the L^∞-norm prevents us from obtaining more detailed information about this kernel, like ultracontractivity). Furthermore, the following holds.

Corollary 4.10. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and K a 2×2-matrix with complex entries and let $u_0 \in H$ (if $Y=\{0\}^2$ or $Y=\{0\}\times\mathbb{C}$) or $u_0\in H_1$ (otherwise). Then the unique solution u to the initial value problem associated with* (4.12)-(4.13)-(4.14) *satisfies $u(t,\cdot)\in C^\infty([0,1])$ and moreover u and its derivatives fulfill the non-local boundary conditions*

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^{(2h-1)}(t,1)-u^{(2h-1)}(t,0)\\ u^{(2h-2)}(t,1)-u^{(2h-2)}(t,0)-u^{(2h-1)}(t,0)\end{pmatrix}\in Y \qquad \textit{for all } h\in\mathbb{N}^*$$

along with

$$K\begin{pmatrix} u^{(2h-1)}(t,1)-u^{(2h-1)}(t,0)\\ u^{(2h-2)}(t,1)-u^{(2h-2)}(t,0)-u^{(2h-1)}(t,0)\end{pmatrix}-\begin{pmatrix} u^{(2h+1)}(t,1)-u^{(2h+1)}(t,0)+u^{(2h)}(t,1)\\ u^{(2h)}(t,0)-u^{(2h)}(t,1)\end{pmatrix}\in Y^\perp \qquad \textit{for all } h\in\mathbb{N}^*,$$

for all $t>0$.

For example, for $Y=\{0\}\times\mathbb{C}$ and $K=0$ this amounts to saying that $u(t,\cdot)$ and all its derivatives fulfill periodic boundary conditions.

Proof. In a way similar to Lemma 3.8 it can be proved that

$$D(A^2_{Y,K})=\{u\in H^3(0,1):\Gamma_1 u,\Gamma_1 u''\in Y \text{ and } K\Gamma_1 u-\Gamma_2 u, K\Gamma_1 u''-\Gamma_2 u''\in Y^\perp\},$$

and we can prove by induction that in fact for all $h\in\mathbb{N}$

$$D(A^h_{Y,K})=\{u\in H^{2h-1}(0,1):\Gamma_1 u^{(2h)}\in Y \text{ and } K\Gamma_1 u^{(2h)}-\Gamma_2 u^{(2h)}\in Y^\perp\ \forall h\le h\},$$

hence in particular

$$\bigcap_{h\in\mathbb{N}} D(A^h_{Y,K})=\{u\in C^\infty([0,1]):\Gamma_1 u^{(2h)}\in Y \text{ and } K\Gamma_1 u^{(2h)}-\Gamma_2 u^{(2h)}\in Y^\perp\ \forall h\in\mathbb{N}\}.$$

Observe that for $u\in H^3(0,1)$

$$\Gamma_2 u=\begin{pmatrix} u'(1)-u'(0)+u(1)\\ u(0)-u(1)\end{pmatrix}$$

and moreover

$$\Gamma_1 u''=\begin{pmatrix} u'(1)-u'(0)\\ u(1)-u(0)-u'(0)\end{pmatrix}$$

along with

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_2 u'' &= \begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u^{(4)})+u''(1)\\ u''(0)-u''(1)\end{pmatrix} && \text{if } u\in H^3(0,1)\\ &= \begin{pmatrix} u^{(3)}(1)-u^{(3)}(0)+u''(1)\\ u''(0)-u''(1)\end{pmatrix} && \text{if } u\in H^4(0,1).\end{aligned}$$

Reasoning similarly we can prove by induction that in fact for $u\in C^\infty([0,1])$

$$\Gamma_1 u^{(2h)}=\begin{pmatrix} u^{(2h-1)}(1)-u^{(2h-1)}(0)\\ u^{(2h-2)}(1)-u^{(2h-2)}(0)-u^{(2h-1)}(0)\end{pmatrix},\qquad \Gamma_2 u^{(2h)}=\begin{pmatrix} u^{(2h+1)}(1)-u^{(2h+1)}(0)+u^{(2h)}(1)\\ u^{(2h)}(0)-u^{(2h)}(1)\end{pmatrix},$$

for all $h\in\mathbb{N}^*$. This concludes the proof, since it is well-known that an analytic semigroup maps immediately into the domain of any power of its generator. ☐

5. SPECTRAL ANALYSIS

Recalling that $A_{Y,K}$ has compact resolvent (due to the compact embedding of $L^2(0,1)$ into $H^{-1}(T)$) and that $A_{Y,K}$ is self-adjoint if K is hermitian, we promptly obtain the following.

Lemma 5.1. *Let Y be a susbpace of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and let K be a 2×2-matrix. Then the operator $A_{Y,K}$ has pure point spectrum, which lies in $\mathbb{R}$ if K is hermitian.*

In view of this Lemma, if K is hermitian we denote by $\lambda^2_{Y,K,k}$, $k\in\mathbb{N}^*$, the eigenvalues of $A_{Y,K}$ enumerated in increasing order.

In this section we will describe the spectrum of the operator $A_{Y,K}$ for all possible subspaces Y and when K is hermitian, obtaining in particular in all cases a Weyl-type asymptotic result. While we do not discuss the dependence of the spectrum with respect to the variation of the subspaces Y, the spaces $Y=\{0\}^2$ and $Y=\mathbb{C}^2$ represent in fact the extremal cases, in the following sense.

Proposition 5.2. *Let Y_1, Y_2 be subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and let K_1, K_2 be hermitian 2×2-matrices. Denote by A_{Y_1,K_1} and A_{Y_2,K_2} the operators associated with the form a_{K_1} with domain V_{Y_1} and with the form a_{K_2} with domain V_{Y_2}, respectively. If Y_2 is a subspace of Y_1 and the matrix $K_2 - K_1$ is positive semidefinite, then*

$$\lambda^2_{Y_1,K_1,k} \leq \lambda^2_{Y_2,K_2,k}, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. The assertions is a direct consequence of the Courant–Fischer minimax theorem, since the operators A_{Y_1,K_1}, A_{Y_2,K_2} are self-adjoint on Hilbert spaces (H or H_1) that are endowed with the same norm and moreover V_{Y_2} is a subspace of V_{Y_1} under the above assumptions. ☐

Combining the previous results we can slightly improve the assertion on exponential stability of $(e^{-tA_{Y,K}})_{t\geq 0}$ contained in Proposition 4.5, under the assumption that K is just positive semidefinite.

Remark 5.3. *Here and in the following of this section we repeatedly use the fact that eigenfunctions of $A_{Y,K}$ are by a standard bootstrap argument in $D(A^2_{Y,K})$, hence in $H^2(0,1)$ by Lemma 3.8 (or its natural pendant, in the setting of Section 4). By Remark 2.6 we can hence regard them as solutions of the more usual eigenvalue problem*

$$-u'' = \lambda^2_{Y,K,k} u.$$

Corollary 5.4. *Let Y be any subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and K be hermitian and positive semidefinite. Then each eigenvalue of $A_{Y,K}$ is strictly positive, and in particular the semigroup $(e^{-tA_{Y,K}})_{t\geq 0}$ is uniformly exponentially stable.*

Proof. Combining Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 we deduce that for any 1-dimensional subspace Y of $\mathbb{C}^2$ the k^{th} eigenvalue of $A_{Y,K}$ is always contained in the interval

$$[\lambda^2_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,k}, \lambda^2_{\{0\}^2,K,k}] = [\lambda^2_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,k}, \lambda^2_{\{0\}^2,0,k}]$$

(Observe that, in view of Theorem 4.3, $A_{\{0\}^2,K} = A_{\{0\}^2,0}$). In fact, letting K be positive semidefinite we deduce – again from Proposition 5.2 – that

$$\lambda^2_{\mathbb{C}^2,0,k} \leq \lambda^2_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,k}.$$

Hence, it suffices to show that all eigenvalues of $A_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}$ are strictly positive. First of all, observe that $A_{\mathbb{C}^2,0}$ is accretive, hence all its eigenvalues are positive. To show that 0 is not an eigenvalue, and hence that $\lambda^2_{\mathbb{C}^2,0,1} > 0$, take u such that $A_{\mathbb{C}^2,0} u = u'' = 0$, i.e.,

$$u(x) := ax + b, \qquad x \in (0,1),$$

for some $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. Observe that

$$\mu_0(u'') + u(1) = a + b \quad \text{and} \quad u(0) - u(1) = -a.$$

If we impose that $(\mu_0(u'') + u(1), u(0) - u(1)) = (0,0)$, then clearly $a = b = 0$, i.e., $u \equiv 0$. This concludes the proof. ☐

5.1. **The case of operators acting on zero mean functions.**

Here we first look for the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of the operator $(A, D(A))$ introduced in Theorem 3.1, which corresponds to the choice $Y = \{0\}^2$ (of course, K does not play any role in this case). More precisely we prove the next result:

Theorem 5.5. *The number λ^2, with $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^*$, is an eigenvalue of $(A, D(A))$ if and only if λ is the root of*

$$D(\lambda) = \lambda \sin \lambda + 2 \cos \lambda - 2 = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

Each eigenvalue is simple and its associated eigenspace is spanned by the function

$$x \mapsto (\sin \lambda - \lambda) \cos(\lambda x) + (1 - \cos \lambda) \sin(\lambda x).$$

Here and in the following we restrict ourselves to the self-adjoint case, hence we can always assume λ to be real. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in D(A)$ be such that

$$Au = \lambda^2 u.$$

Theorem 3.1 (and, for later purposes, also its analogues Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 4.3) yields

$$u'' = -\lambda^2 u.$$

By Corollary 5.4 $\lambda \neq 0$, and therefore u is of the form

$$u(x) = c_1 \cos(\lambda x) + c_2 \sin(\lambda x),$$

for some real numbers c_1 and c_2. By direct computations we see that

$$\mu_0(u) = \int_0^1 u(x)\,dx = \frac{1}{\lambda}(c_1 \sin\lambda + (1-\cos\lambda)c_2),$$

and

$$\mu_1(u) = \int_0^1 (1-x)u(x)\,dx = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\left((1-\cos\lambda)c_1 + (\lambda - \sin\lambda)c_2\right).$$

For the sake of later reference we also observe that

$$\begin{aligned} u(1) &= c_1\cos\lambda + c_2\sin\lambda,\\ u(0) &= c_1,\\ u'(1) &= -\lambda c_1 \sin\lambda + \lambda c_2\cos\lambda,\\ u'(0) &= \lambda c_2, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\Gamma_1 u = \mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2\end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \sin\lambda & 1-\cos\lambda \\ 1-\cos\lambda & \lambda-\sin\lambda\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2\end{pmatrix} \tag{5.2}$$

while

$$\Gamma_2 u = \mathcal{C}(\lambda)\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2\end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda\sin\lambda - \cos\lambda & \lambda(1-\cos\lambda)-\sin\lambda \\ \cos\lambda - 1 & \sin\lambda\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2\end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.3}$$

where Γ_1, Γ_2 are the operators introduced in (4.2).

Proof of Theorem 5.5. We look for a solution of the previous differential equation that satisfies

$$\int_0^1 u(x)\,dx = \int_0^1 (1-x)u(x)\,dx = 0.$$

Consequently we find the system

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda)\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0\end{pmatrix},$$

where the 2×2-matrix $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ is defined as in (5.2). Hence a non trivial solution exists if and only the determinant of $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ is zero. This proves the first part of the theorem since this determinant is precisely equal to $D(\lambda)$.

For the second part of the proof, it suffices to show that a root λ of D cannot be simultaneously a root of its derivative. Namely let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be a solution of

$$D(\lambda) = D'(\lambda) = 0.$$

Hence we find the system

$$\begin{cases} \lambda\sin\lambda + 2\cos\lambda - 2 = 0 \\ \lambda\cos\lambda - \sin\lambda = 0. \end{cases}$$

Plugging the second equation into the first one yields

$$\cos\lambda = \frac{2}{2+\lambda^2}.$$

By the second equation and the trigonometric relation $\cos^2\lambda + \sin^2\lambda = 1$ we arrive at

$$4(1+\lambda^2) = (2+\lambda^2)^2,$$

whose unique solution is $\lambda = 0$. □

Corollary 5.6. *Denote by* λ_k^2, $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, *the eigenvalue of* A *enumerated in increasing order. Then*

$$\lambda_{2k} = 2k\pi, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*, \tag{5.4}$$

while

$$\lambda_{2k-1} = (2k-1)\pi + O(k^{-1}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*. \tag{5.5}$$

Consequently the Weyl-type asymptotics

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_k^2}{k^2\pi^2} = 1.$$

holds.

Proof. We directly check that $2k\pi$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is a solution of (5.1). For the other roots, we notice that (5.1) is then equivalent to

$$\sin\lambda + \frac{2}{\lambda}(\cos\lambda - 1) = 0$$

or

$$f_\infty(\lambda) + r(\lambda) = 0,$$

where

$$f_\infty(z) = \sin z$$

is analytic and the remainder $r(z) = \frac{2(\cos z-1)}{z}$ is also analytic (except at $z = 0$) and satisfies

$$|r(z)| \leq \frac{4}{|z|}, \qquad \forall |z| \neq 0.$$

We prove (5.5) by applying Rouché's theorem in the ball $B_k = B_k(k\pi, \epsilon_k)$ where $0 < \epsilon_k \leq 1$ will be fixed later on. We first minorize $|f_\infty(z)|$ on ∂B_k. By trigonometric formula, we check that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} |f_\infty(k\pi + \epsilon_k e^{it})|^2 & = & |f_\infty(\epsilon_k e^{it})|^2 \\ & = & |\sin(\epsilon_k e^{it})|^2 \\ & = & \cosh^2(\epsilon_k \sin t) - \cos^2(\epsilon_k \cos t). \end{array}$$

Hence we have

$$|f_\infty(k\pi + \epsilon_k e^{it})|^2 \geq \cosh(\epsilon_k \sin t) - \cos(\epsilon_k \cos t).$$

Using the inequalities

$$\cosh(x) \geq 1 + \frac{x^2}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \cos(x) \leq 1 - \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{x^4}{24}, \qquad \forall x \in [0, 1],$$

we obtain

$$|f_\infty(2k\pi + \epsilon_k e^{it})|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_k^2 - \frac{1}{24}\epsilon_k^4 \cos^4 t \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_k^2 - \frac{1}{24}\epsilon_k^4 \geq \frac{11}{24}\epsilon_k^2.$$

On the other hand

$$|r(k\pi + \epsilon_k e^{it})| \leq \frac{4}{k\pi - 1}.$$

Hence we take $\epsilon_k = \dfrac{C}{k}$, with C chosen such that

$$\sqrt{\frac{11}{24}}\epsilon_k > \frac{4}{k\pi - 1}, \qquad \forall k \geq 1.$$

In conclusion for all $k \geq 1$ and $\epsilon_k = \sqrt{\dfrac{C}{k}}$ with $C > 0$ fixed above we have

$$|r(z)| < |f_\infty(z)|, \qquad \forall z \in \partial B_k.$$

According to Rouché's theorem, for k large enough f admits a unique root in the ball B_k, since f_∞ has this property. This proves (5.5).

Weyl's formula is a direct consequence of (5.4) and (5.5). □

Remark 5.7. *Using a Taylor expansion of higher order, we can even show that*

$$\lambda_{2k-1} = (2k-1)\pi - \frac{1}{4(2k-1)\pi} + O(k^{-1}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

5.2. **The general case.** In this section we will pursue a similar programme. In fact, in spite of its broader generality (and of some technical difficulties), the case of operators that are not subject to *both* conditions $\mu_0 = \mu_1 = 0$ can be discussed in essentially the same way. If we are imposing integral conditions associated with a general subspace Y and a general hermitian matrix K instead, then by Theorem 4.3 we know that the relevant conditions are

$$P_{Y^\perp}\Gamma_1 u = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad P_Y(K\Gamma_1 u - \Gamma_2 u) = 0,$$

or rather, taking into account (5.2) and (5.3),

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_{Y^\perp}\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \\ P_Y(K\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda) - \mathcal{C}(\lambda)) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Since an eigenvalue corresponds to a non-trivial solution (c_1, c_2) of this linear system, we directly obtain the following – of which Theorem 5.5 is a special case.

Theorem 5.8. *Let K be a hermitian 2×2-matrix and Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$. A number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^*$ is such that λ^2 is an eigenvalue of $A_{Y,K}$ if and only if the 4×2-matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_{Y^\perp}\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \\ P_Y(K\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda) - \mathcal{C}(\lambda)) \end{pmatrix}$$

does not have maximal rank.

Remark 5.9. *Of course, in our setting the space Y can only have dimension 0, 1 or 2. Therefore, the condition in Theorem 5.8 can be specialised in an easy way. If $\dim Y = 0$ this yields exactly* (5.1)*, whereas the following holds in the remaining cases.*

(1) In the special case of $Y = \mathbb{C}^2$, the condition in Theorem 5.8 simplifies to requiring that λ be a root of the equation

$$D_K(\lambda) := \det\left(K\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda) - \mathcal{C}(\lambda)\right) = 0.$$

(2) Similarly, if Y is spanned by (x, y) with $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|x|^2 + |y|^2 = 1$, then

$$P_Y\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = (\bar{x}\ \ \bar{y})\cdot\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and } P_{Y^\perp}\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = (-\bar{y}\ \ \bar{x})\cdot\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} -y \\ x \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consequently,

$$P_Y\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = 0 \qquad \text{(resp. } P_{Y^\perp}\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = 0\text{)}$$

if and only if

$$(\bar{x}\ \ \bar{y})\cdot\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = 0 \qquad \text{(resp. } (-\bar{y}\ \ \bar{x})\cdot\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = 0\text{)}.$$

This characterization and Theorem 5.8 show that λ^2 is an eigenvalue of $A_{Y,K}$ if and only if

$$D_{Y,K}(\lambda) = \det\begin{pmatrix} (-\bar{y}, \bar{x})\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \\ (\bar{x}, \bar{y})(K\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda) - \mathcal{C}(\lambda)) \end{pmatrix} = 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Corollary 5.10. *Let K be a hermitian 2×2-matrix. Recall that $\lambda^2_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,k}, k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, denote the eigenvalues of $A_{\mathbb{C}^2,K}$ enumerated in increasing order. Then*

$$\lambda_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,2k} = 2k\pi + O(k^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad \textit{and} \quad \lambda_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,2k-1} = 2k\pi + O(k^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*. \tag{5.7}$$

Again, we deduce validity of the Weyl-type asymptotics

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda^2_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,2k}}{k^2\pi^2} = 1.$$

Proof. We closely follow the arguments of the proof of Corollary 5.6 By direct calculations we see that

$$D_K(\lambda) = 2\lambda\left(1 - \cos\lambda + g_1(\lambda)\lambda^{-1} + \ldots + g_4(\lambda)\lambda^{-4}\right),$$

where the g_i are finite linear combinations of 1, $\cos\lambda$, $\sin\lambda$, $\cos^2\lambda$ and $\cos\lambda\sin\lambda$. Hence

$$D_K(\lambda_k) = 0 \Leftrightarrow f_\infty(\lambda_k) + r(\lambda_k) = 0,$$

where $f_\infty(z) = 1 - \cos z$ is analytic and the remainder $r(z) = g_1(z)z^{-1} + \ldots + g_4(z)z^{-4}$ is also analytic (except at $z = 0$) and there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|r(z)| \leq \frac{C}{|z|}, \qquad \forall |z| \neq 0.$$

We again prove (5.7) by applying Rouché's theorem in the ball $B_k = B_k(2k\pi, \epsilon_k)$ where $0 < \epsilon_k \leq 1$ will be fixed later on. We first minorize $|f_\infty(z)|$ on ∂B_k. Applying trigonometric formulae we check that

$$\begin{aligned} |f_\infty(2k\pi + \epsilon_k e^{it})|^2 &= |f_\infty(\epsilon_k e^{it})|^2 \\ &= |1 - \cos(\epsilon_k e^{it})|^2 \\ &= (\cosh(\epsilon_k \sin t) - \cos(\epsilon_k \cos t))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$|f_\infty(k\pi + \epsilon_k e^{it})| \geq \cosh(\epsilon_k \sin t) - \cos(\epsilon_k \cos t),$$

and as before we obtain

$$|f_\infty(2k\pi + \epsilon_k e^{it})| \geq \frac{11}{24}\epsilon_k^2.$$

On the other hand there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$|r(2k\pi + \epsilon_k e^{it})| \leq \frac{C_1}{k}, \qquad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Hence we take $\epsilon_k = \dfrac{C_2}{k}$, with C_2 chosen such that

$$\frac{11}{24}\epsilon_k > \frac{C_1}{k}, \qquad \forall k \geq 1.$$

In conclusion for all $k \geq 1$ and $\epsilon_k = \dfrac{C_2}{k}$ with $C_2 > 0$ fixed above we have

$$|r(z)| < |f_\infty(z)|, \qquad \forall z \in \partial B_k.$$

According to Rouché's theorem, for k large enough, f admits two roots in the ball B_k, since f_∞ has the double root $2k\pi$ in this ball. This proves (5.7).

As before, Weyl's formula is a direct consequence of (5.7). □

Remark 5.11. *From the previous considerations, we see that the highest order term of the asymptotic of the eigenvalues does not depend on K, but lower order terms do. Indeed using a Taylor expansion of higher order we can even show that there exist two real numbers C_1 and C_2 (depending on K) such that*

$$\lambda_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,2k-1} = 2k\pi + \frac{C_1}{k} + O(k^{-1}), \qquad \lambda_{\mathbb{C}^2,K,2k} = 2k\pi + \frac{C_2}{k} + O(k^{-1}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

Corollary 5.12. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$, $Y \neq \{0\}^2$ and $Y \neq \mathbb{C}^2$. We distinguish the following cases:*

(i) If Y is spanned by $(0,1)$, then (cf. (5.7))

$$\lambda_{Y,K,2k} = 2k\pi + O(k^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad \textit{and} \quad \lambda_{Y,K,2k-1} = 2k\pi + O(k^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*. \tag{5.8}$$

(ii) If Y is spanned by $(1,\alpha)$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, then

$$\lambda_{Y,K,k} = k\pi + O(k^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*. \tag{5.9}$$

In either case, we again deduce validity of the Weyl-type asymptotics

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_{Y,K,k}^2}{k^2\pi^2} = 1.$$

Proof. In view of (5.2) and (5.3), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} (-\bar{y}\ \ \bar{x})\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(-\bar{y}\ \ \bar{x})\begin{pmatrix} \lambda\sin\lambda & \lambda(1-\cos\lambda) \\ 1-\cos\lambda & \lambda - \sin\lambda \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(-\bar{y}\lambda\sin\lambda + \bar{x}(1-\cos\lambda) \quad -\bar{y}\lambda(1-\cos\lambda) + \bar{x}(\lambda - \sin\lambda)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(-\bar{y}\lambda\sin\lambda + \bar{x}(1-\cos\lambda) \quad \lambda(\bar{x} - \bar{y}(1-\cos\lambda)) - \bar{x}\sin\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}(\bar{x}\ \ \bar{y})K\mathcal{M}(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)-\mathcal{C}(\lambda) &= (\bar{x}\ \ \bar{y})\left[\begin{pmatrix}\frac{k_{11}}{\lambda}\sin\lambda+\frac{k_{12}}{\lambda^2}(1-\cos\lambda) & \frac{k_{11}}{\lambda}(1-\cos\lambda)+\frac{k_{12}}{\lambda^2}(\lambda-\sin\lambda)\\ \frac{k_{21}}{\lambda}\sin\lambda+\frac{k_{22}}{\lambda^2}(1-\cos\lambda) & \frac{k_{21}}{\lambda}(1-\cos\lambda)+\frac{k_{22}}{\lambda^2}(\lambda-\sin\lambda)\end{pmatrix}\right.\\ &\qquad\left.-\begin{pmatrix}\lambda\sin\lambda-\cos\lambda & \lambda(1-\cos\lambda)-\sin\lambda\\ \cos\lambda-1 & \sin\lambda\end{pmatrix}\right]\\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(\bar{x}\ \ \bar{y})\left[\begin{pmatrix}k_{11}\lambda\sin\lambda+k_{12}(1-\cos\lambda) & k_{11}\lambda(1-\cos\lambda)+k_{12}(\lambda-\sin\lambda)\\ k_{21}\lambda\sin\lambda+k_{22}(1-\cos\lambda) & k_{21}\lambda(1-\cos\lambda)+k_{22}(\lambda-\sin\lambda)\end{pmatrix}\right.\\ &\qquad\left.-\begin{pmatrix}\lambda^3\sin\lambda-\lambda^2\cos\lambda & \lambda^3(1-\cos\lambda)-\lambda^2\sin\lambda\\ \lambda^2(\cos\lambda-1) & \lambda^2\sin\lambda\end{pmatrix}\right]\\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\begin{pmatrix}-\bar{x}(\lambda^3\sin\lambda-\lambda^2\cos\lambda)+\bar{y}\lambda^2(1-\cos\lambda)+q_1(\lambda)\\ -\bar{x}\lambda^3(1-\cos\lambda)+\bar{x}\lambda^2\sin\lambda-\bar{y}\lambda^2\sin\lambda+q_2(\lambda)\end{pmatrix}^\top\\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\begin{pmatrix}-\bar{x}\lambda^3\sin\lambda+\lambda^2(\bar{x}\cos\lambda+\bar{y}(1-\cos\lambda))+q_1(\lambda)\\ -\bar{x}\lambda^3(1-\cos\lambda)+\lambda^2\sin\lambda(\bar{x}-\bar{y})+q_2(\lambda)\end{pmatrix}^\top,\end{aligned}$$

where $q_i(\lambda)$ is a polynomial in λ of degree ≤ 1 with coefficients which are finite linear combinations of 1, $\cos\lambda$, $\sin\lambda$, $\cos^2\lambda$. Therefore by (5.6) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}D_{Y,K}(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{\lambda^4}\det\begin{pmatrix}-\bar{y}\lambda\sin\lambda+\bar{x}(1-\cos\lambda) & \lambda(\bar{x}-\bar{y}(1-\cos\lambda))-\bar{x}\sin\lambda\\ -\bar{x}\lambda^3\sin\lambda+\lambda^2(\bar{x}\cos\lambda+\bar{y}(1-\cos\lambda))+q_1(\lambda) & -\bar{x}\lambda^3(1-\cos\lambda)+\lambda^2\sin\lambda(\bar{x}-\bar{y})+q_2(\lambda))\end{pmatrix}\\ &= \bar{x}\sin\lambda+2\lambda^{-1}(\bar{y}^2-\bar{x}\bar{y}-\bar{x}^2)(1-\cos\lambda)+g_2(\lambda)\lambda^{-2}+\ldots+g_4(\lambda)\lambda^{-4},\end{aligned}$$

where the g_i are finite linear combinations of 1, $\cos\lambda$, $\sin\lambda$, $\cos^2\lambda$, and $\cos\lambda\sin\lambda$.

Hence the arguments in the proof of Corollary 5.10 yield the conclusion by dividing the cases $x=0$ and $x\neq 0$. ☐

Remark 5.13. *Observe that the Weyl-type formula from the previous Corollary is also a consequence of the comparison principle of Proposition 5.2 and Corollaries 5.6 and 5.10. On the other hand formulas* (5.8) *and* (5.9) *(that cannot be deduced from the comparison principle) are more precise than the Weyl formula. As in Remark 5.11, the highest order term of the eigenvalue asymptotics does not depend on K, but lower order terms do.*

6. Dynamic integral conditions

We conclude our article by discussing a different situation. We complement the heat or wave equations with the condition

$$\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u(t))\\ \mu_1(u(t))\end{pmatrix}\in Y,\qquad t\geq 0,$$

along with the dynamic-type one

$$\frac{d}{dt}\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u(t))\\ \mu_1(u(t))\end{pmatrix}=-P_Y\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u''(t))+u(t,1)\\ u(t,0)-u(t,1)\end{pmatrix}-P_YK\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u(t))\\ \mu_1(u(t))\end{pmatrix},\qquad t\geq 0, \tag{6.1}$$

for some subspace Y of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and some 2×2-matrix K.

An educated guess suggests to consider the same sesquilinear form a_K defined in (4.7), this time with form domain

$$\mathcal{V}_Y:=\left\{\begin{pmatrix}u\\ \phi\end{pmatrix}\in V_Y\times Y:\begin{pmatrix}\mu_0(u)\\ \mu_1(u)\end{pmatrix}=\phi\right\}\equiv\left\{\begin{pmatrix}u\\ \Gamma_1 u\end{pmatrix}:u\in V_Y\right\},$$

for some 2×2-matrix K with complex entries. In fact, the following holds, where we are using the spaces H, H_1 introduced in Section 2 and Section 4, respectively. We write

$$\mathcal{H}:=H_1\times\mathbb{C}^2$$

and denote by$(\cdot|\cdot)_{\mathcal{H}}$ the canonical inner product of the Hilbert product space $\mathcal{H}$, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{H}}:=(u|v)_{H_1}+(\phi|\psi)_{\mathbb{C}^2},\qquad\forall\mathbf{u}=\begin{pmatrix}u\\ \phi\end{pmatrix},\mathbf{v}=\begin{pmatrix}v\\ \psi\end{pmatrix}\in\mathcal{H}.$$

Lemma 6.1. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Then the closure of $\mathcal{V}_Y$ in $\mathcal{H}$ is*

$$H \times Y, \qquad \text{if } Y = \{0\}^2 \text{ or } Y = \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g \\ (y_0, y_1)^\top \end{pmatrix} \in H_1 \times Y : y_0 = \mu_0(g) \right\}, \qquad \text{otherwise.}$$

We will denote in either case by $\mathcal{H}_Y$ the closure of $\mathcal{V}_Y$. We will also write

$$H_* := \begin{cases} H, & \text{if } Y = \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}, \\ H_1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof is performed by first considering separately the cases where Y is a Cartesian product.

1) Let us first consider the case of $Y = \{0\}^2$ or $Y = \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$. Then the assertion can be proved letting

$$L := \Gamma_1, \qquad X_1 := V_Y, \qquad X_2 := H, \qquad Y_1 = Y_2 = Y.$$

Observe that $L : V_Y \to Y$ is a bounded and (by Remark 4.1) surjective operator. If we show that

$$\ker L = \{g \in V_Y : \mu_0(g) = \mu_1(g) = 0\} \equiv V$$

is dense in $X_2 = H$, the claim will actually follow directly from [28, Lemma 5.6]. But this is exactly the assertion of Corollary 2.8.

2) Let us now consider the case of $Y = \mathbb{C} \times \{0\}$ or $Y = \mathbb{C}^2$. This time, the assertion can be proved applying [28, Lemma 5.6] with

$$L : \mathbb{V}_Y \ni \begin{pmatrix} g \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \mu_1(g) \in \mathbb{C}.$$

and

$$X_1 := \mathbb{V}_Y, \quad X_2 := \mathbb{H}_1, \quad Y_1 = Y_2 = \{0\} \text{ or } = \mathbb{C},$$

respectively, where

$$\mathbb{V}_Y := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} \in V_Y \times \mathbb{C} : y_0 = \mu_0(g) \right\} \simeq V_Y, \qquad \mathbb{H}_1 := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H_1 \times \mathbb{C} : y_0 = \mu_0(g) \right\} \simeq H_1.$$

The identifications are performed with respect to the isomorphism

$$\begin{pmatrix} g \\ \mu_0(g) \end{pmatrix} \mapsto g.$$

In fact, $\mathcal{V}_Y$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{V}_Y = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{V}_Y \times \mathbb{C} : Lx = y \right\}$$

and we also have that

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g \\ (y_0, y_1)^\top \end{pmatrix} \in H_1 \times Y : y_0 = \mu_0(g) \right\} = \mathbb{H}_1 \times \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \text{or} \\ \mathbb{C} \end{cases}$$

Also in this setting L is a bounded and surjective operator, and moreover

$$\ker L = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} \in L^2(0,1) \times \mathbb{C} : y_0 = \mu_0(g),\ \mu_1(g) = 0 \right\} \simeq V_{\mathbb{C} \times \{0\}}$$

is dense in $X_2 \simeq H_1$ by Theorem 4.2.

3) Finally, let Y be the subspace spanned by a vector $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix}$ for some $\alpha \neq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g \\ (y_0, y_1)^\top \end{pmatrix} \in H_1 \times Y : y_0 = \mu_0(g) \right\} &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g \\ (y_0, y_1)^\top \end{pmatrix} \in H_1 \times \mathbb{C}^2 : y_0 = \mu_0(g), y_1 = \alpha y_0 \right\} \\ &\simeq \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H_1 \times \mathbb{C} : y_0 = \mu_0(g) \right\} \\ &\simeq H_1 \end{aligned}$$

whereas with the notation introduced in 2)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_Y &= \left\{\begin{pmatrix}u\\ \phi\end{pmatrix} \in V_Y \times \mathbb{C}^2 : \Gamma_1(u) = \phi \in Y\right\}\\ &= \left\{\begin{pmatrix}x\\ y\end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{V}_Y \times \mathbb{C} : Lx = y\right\}\\ &\simeq \mathbb{V}_Y \simeq V_Y.\end{aligned}$$

Since V_Y is dense in H_1, the claim follows. $\square$

As in the previous sections we obtain the following.

Proposition 6.2. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and let K be a 2×2-matrix. The form a_K with domain $\mathcal{V}_Y$ is bounded and elliptic. It satisfies the Crouzeix condition. It is coercive (resp., accretive) if both eigenvalues of K have strictly positive (resp., positive) real part. It is symmetric if K is hermitian.*

Therefore, the operator $-\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}$ associated with the form generates a cosine operator function with phase space $\mathcal{V}_Y \times \mathcal{H}_Y$ and hence an analytic semigroup $(e^{-t\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}})_{t\geq 0}$ of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ on $\mathcal{H}_Y$. This semigroup is immediately of trace class, and it is exponentially stable if both eigenvalues of K have strictly positive real part.

Remark 6.3. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and let K be a hermitian 2×2-matrix. Then both operators $A_{Y,K}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}$ are self-adjoint, and it follows by a direct application of Courant's minimax formula that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the k^{th} eigenvalue of $A_{Y,K}$ is at least as large as the k^{th} eigenvalue of $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}$.*

Hence, it only remains to identify the operator $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}$. If $Y = \{0\}^2$, then it is apparent that the above conditions reduce to those in (3.1), which have already been fully discussed in Section 3. Otherwise, the following holds.

Theorem 6.4. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$, $Y \neq \{0\}^2$, and let K be a 2×2-matrix. Then the operator matrix $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}$ associated with the form a_K with domain $\mathcal{V}_Y$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}D(\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}) &= \left\{\begin{pmatrix}u\\ \Gamma_1 u\end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V}_Y : u \in H^1(0,1)\right\},\\ \mathcal{A}_{Y,K} &= \begin{pmatrix}-\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \delta_1 c(\cdot) & 0\\ P_Y\begin{pmatrix}\delta_1(\cdot) + c(\cdot)\\ \delta_0(\cdot) - \delta_1(\cdot)\end{pmatrix} & P_Y K\end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

where $c : H^1(0,1) \to \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded linear functional defined by

(6.2)

$$c(u) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } Y = \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^2,\\ -\left(1 + \left(P_Y\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix} \Big| \begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix}\right)_{\mathbb{C}^2}\right)^{-1}\left(\left(K\Gamma_1 u + \begin{pmatrix}u(1)\\ u(0)-u(1)\end{pmatrix}\Big|\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix}\right)_{\mathbb{C}^2}\right), & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Proof. Denote

$$\mathcal{K}_2 := \left\{\begin{pmatrix}u\\ \Gamma_1 u\end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V}_Y : u \in H^1(0,1)\right\}.$$

Let us first show that $D(\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}) \subset \mathcal{K}_2$. Let $\mathbf{f} \in D(\mathcal{A}_{Y,K})$. Then $f \in V_Y$ and there exists

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{pmatrix}g\\ y\end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}_Y,$$

with $g = H_*$ and $y \in Y$ (satisfying in particular

$$y_0 := \left(y \Big| \begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix}\right)_{\mathbb{C}^2} = \mu_0(g).$$

if $Y \neq \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$) such that

$$(f|h)_{L^2} + (K\Gamma_1 f|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} =: a_K(\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h}) \overset{!}{=} (\mathbf{g}|\mathbf{h})_{\mathcal{H}_Y} := \int_0^1 (Pg)(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx + (y|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} + \mu_0(g)\mu_0(\bar{h}) \tag{6.3}$$

for all $\mathbf{h} = \begin{pmatrix} h \\ \Gamma_1 h \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V}_Y$. Because $g \in H^{-1}(T)$, by Remark 2.10.(6) we can consider $P(Pg)$ that belongs to $H^1(T)$, and hence integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 (Pg)(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx &= \int_0^1 (P(Pg))'(x)(P\bar{h})(x)\,dx \\ &= -\int_0^1 (P(Pg))(x)\bar{h}(x)\,dx + [PPg(P\bar{h})]_0^1, \qquad \forall h \in V_Y. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (6.3) yields

$$(f|h)_{L^2} = (-P(Pg) + p|h)_{L^2}, \qquad \forall h \in V_Y,$$

where p is a polynomial of degree ≤ 1. Therefore

$$f = (I - \Pi)(-P(Pg) + p) = -P(Pg) + \Pi P(Pg) \tag{6.4}$$

and proves that f belongs to $H^1(0,1)$ and that $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K} f = g = -f''$ in the distributional sense (i.e., as an identity of elements of $\mathcal{D}'(0,1)$). Because $g + \mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') \in \ker \mathrm{Id}_m$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$g = -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') - c(f)\delta_1,$$

where $c(f) = -\mu_0(g)$.

We still have to prove that $c(f)$ agrees with the expression defined in (6.2) and also that y agrees with

$$z := P_Y \left(K\Gamma_1 f + \begin{pmatrix} f(1) + c(f) \\ f(0) - f(1) \end{pmatrix} \right). \tag{6.5}$$

One can see just like in the proof of Theorem 4.3 that $c(f)$ satisfies

$$\left(K\Gamma_1 f - y + \begin{pmatrix} f(1) + c(f) \\ f(0) - f(1) \end{pmatrix} \Big| \Gamma_1 h \right)_{\mathbb{C}^2} = 0, \quad \forall h \in V_Y. \tag{6.6}$$

Hence by the surjectivity of the mapping Γ_1, we deduce that

$$P_Y \left(K\Gamma_1 f - y + \begin{pmatrix} f(1) + c(f) \\ f(0) - f(1) \end{pmatrix} \right) = 0, \tag{6.7}$$

which directly yields $z = y$.

We finally need to show that $c(f)$ defined by (6.6) coincides with the one in (6.2). In the case of $Y = \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$, we directly have $\mu_0(g) = 0$, hence $c(f) = 0$. It then remains to consider the case $Y \neq \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$. But in that case, by definition of $c(f)$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} c(f) &= -\left(P_Y \left(K\Gamma_1 f + \begin{pmatrix} f(1) \\ f(0) - f(1) \end{pmatrix} \right) \Big| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)_{\mathbb{C}^2} - c(f) \left(P_Y \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \Big| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)_{\mathbb{C}^2} \\ &= -\left(P_Y \left(K\Gamma_1 f + \begin{pmatrix} f(1) + c(f) \\ f(0) - f(1) \end{pmatrix} \right) \Big| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)_{\mathbb{C}^2} \\ &= -\left(y \Big| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)_{\mathbb{C}^2} \\ &= -\mu_0(g). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, because the first coordinates of $\Gamma_1 g$ and y coincide, we also deduce that z and y agree, as in the one-dimensional space Y the first coordinate uniquely determines the second one. Observe that we have in particular proved that $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}\mathbf{f}$ is a well-defined element of $\mathcal{H}_Y$.

Conversely, in order to prove that $\mathcal{K}_2 \subset D(\mathcal{A}_{Y,K})$ take

$$\mathbf{f} = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ \Gamma_1 f \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}_2, \quad \mathbf{h} = \begin{pmatrix} h \\ \Gamma_1 h \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V}_Y.$$

Then we can take $g \in H_*$ given by

$$g := -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}(f'') - c(f)\delta_1,$$

and $z \in Y$ as in (6.5). We have to prove that

$$\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}\mathbf{f} = \begin{pmatrix} g \\ z \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.13 we find that for all $h \in L^2(0,1)$

$$(g|h)_{H^{-1}(T)} = -\left(\begin{pmatrix} c(f) + f(1) \\ f(0) - f(1) \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(h) \\ \mu_1(h) \end{pmatrix}\right)_{\mathbb{C}^2} + (f|h)_{L^2}.$$

But taking $h \in V_Y$ and using (6.5) allow to transform the first term of this right-hand side and to obtain

$$(g|h)_{H^{-1}(T)} = (K\Gamma_1 f - z|\Gamma_1 h)_{\mathbb{C}^2} + (f|h)_{L^2}, \qquad \forall h \in V_Y.$$

Since this identity is equivalent to

$$(g|h)_{H^{-1}(T)} + (z|\Gamma_1(h))_{\mathbb{C}^2} = (K\Gamma_1(f)|\Gamma_1(h))_{\mathbb{C}^2} + (f|h)_{L^2} = a_K(\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h}), \qquad \forall h \in V_Y,$$

we have shown that $\mathbf{f}$ belongs to $D(\mathcal{A}_{Y,K})$ and that $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}\mathbf{f}$ has the claimed form. □

Reasoning as in Theorem 4.6 we see that whenever

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ \Gamma_1 u \end{pmatrix} \in D(\mathcal{A}_{Y,K})$$

with $u \in H^2(0,1)$, then $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}$ acts on its first component as the second derivative. Accordingly, we have the following.

Corollary 6.5. *Let K be hermitian and Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Then the semigroup $(e^{-t\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}})_{t\geq 0}$ on $\mathcal{H}_Y$ leaves $\mathcal{V}_Y$ invariant and its restriction is a semigroup on $\mathcal{V}_Y$ that is analytic of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ and immediately of trace class. Its generator is the part $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{V}_Y}_{Y,K}$ of $\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}$ in $\mathcal{V}_Y$, which is explicitly given by*

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{V}_Y}_{Y,K}) &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \phi \end{pmatrix} \in D(\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}) : u \in H^2(0,1) \right\}, \\ A^{V,Y}_{Y,K} &= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} & 0 \\ P_Y(K\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2) & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by standard perturbation results one may deduce that in fact our heat equation is governed by an analytic semigroup on $\mathcal{H}_Y$ even if we replace (6.1) by the more general condition

$$\frac{d}{dt}\begin{pmatrix} \mu_0(u(t)) \\ \mu_1(u(t)) \end{pmatrix} = -Qu(t), \qquad t \geq 0,$$

for any bounded linear operator $Q : H^1(0,1) \to Y$.

Corollary 6.6. *Let Y be a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^2$, $Y \neq \{0\}^2$. Let R be a bounded linear operator on H_* and Q be*

- *an arbitrary bounded linear operator from $H^1(0,1)$ to Y, if $Y = \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$; or else*
- *an arbitrary bounded linear operator from $H^1(0,1)$ to Y such that*

$$\left(Qu \middle| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \mu_0(Ru), \quad \forall u \in H^1(0,1),$$

  if $Y \neq \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}$.

Then the operator matrix

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{B}) &:= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \phi \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V}_Y : u \in H^1(0,1) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B} &:= \begin{pmatrix} -\mathrm{Id}_m^{-1}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + R & 0 \\ Q & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

generates an analytic semigroup on $\mathcal{H}_Y$.

Proof. It suffices to write $\mathcal{B}$ as

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_{Y,K} + \mathcal{B}_0 + \mathcal{B}_1,$$

where $\mathcal{B}_0 : D(\mathcal{A}_{Y,K}) \to \mathcal{H}_Y$ is the relatively compact operator defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_0 \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \Gamma_1 u \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \delta_1 c(u) \\ -P_Y \left(K\Gamma_1 u + \begin{pmatrix} u(1) + c(u) \\ u(0) - u(1) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\mathcal{B}_1$ is a bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{H}_Y$ defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_1 := \begin{pmatrix} R & 0 \\ Q & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, Q has finite dimensional range and hence $\mathcal{B}_1$ is relatively compact. Accordingly, it suffices to apply a well-known perturbation result [18] to conclude. ☐

Remark 6.7. *In the literature, inhomogeneous integral conditions of the form*

$$\int_0^1 u(t,x)\,dx = E_1(t), \qquad \int_0^1 (1-x)u(t,x)\,dx = E_2(t), \qquad t > 0,$$

are often considered. Reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 3.8 we see that the first coordinate of any element of $D(\mathcal{A}_Y^2)$ *lies in particular in* $H^2(0,1)$, *hence the semigroup generated by* $\mathcal{A}_Y^2$ *maps immediately into functions whose first coordinate does not only satisfy the generalized heat equation* (3.3), *but also the classical one. In view of the known semigroup approach to evolution equations with inhomogeneous conditions (see e.g.* [3, §6.2]*), Corollary 6.6 allows us to consider general inhomogenous conditions of the form*

$$P_{Y^\perp}\Gamma_1(u(t)) = E(t), \qquad t > 0,$$

along with (4.13) *for the inhomogeneous heat equation*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t,x) = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,x) + \psi(t), \qquad t > 0,\ x \in (0,1),$$

and to prove well-posedness of the associated evolution equation, provided some smoothness of the time dependence of ψ, E *is assumed* ($\psi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+, H_*), E \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+, Y^\perp)$ *will do for a mild solution, and* $\psi \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+, H_*), E \in W^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_+, Y^\perp)$ *will even yield a classical solution, cf.* [23, §3]*). In fact, in view of Corollary 5.4 the operator* $A_{Y,K}$ *is invertible as long as* K *is positive semidefinite and therefore we can even write down an explicit formula for the solution (in dependence of the semigroup generated by* $A_{Y,K}$*), cf.* [23, Prop. 3.9].

Acknowledgement. We thank D. Mercier (Lamav, University of Valenciennes) for his help in the proof of Corollaries 5.6 and 5.10. The first author is partially supported by the Land Baden–Württemberg in the framework of the *Juniorprofessorenprogramm* – research project on “Symmetry methods in quantum graphs”.

References

[1] W. Arendt. Semigroups and evolution equations: Functional calculus, regularity and kernel estimates. In C.M. Dafermos and E. Feireisl, editors, *Handbook of Differential Equations: Evolutionary Equations – Vol. 1*. North Holland, Amsterdam, 2004.

[2] W. Arendt. Heat Kernels – Manuscript of the 9th Internet Seminar, 2006. Freely available at `http://www.uni-ulm.de/fileadmin/website_uni_ulm/mawi.inst.020/arendt/downloads/internetseminar.pdf`.

[3] W. Arendt, C.J.K. Batty, M. Hieber, and F. Neubrander. *Vector-Valued Laplace Transforms and Cauchy Problems*, volume 96 of *Monographs in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001.

[4] J. von Below. A characteristic equation associated with an eigenvalue problem on C^2-networks. *Lin. Algebra Appl.*, 71:309–325, 1985.

[5] A. Bobrowski and D. Mugnolo. On moment preserving cosine families and semigroups. (in preparation).

[6] A. Bouziani. On the solvability of a class of singular parabolic equations with nonlocal boundary condition in nonclassical function spaces. *Int. J. Math. and Math. Sci.*, 30:435–447, 2002.

[7] A. Bouziani. Initial-boundary value problems for a class of pseudoparabolic equations with integral boundary conditions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 291:371–386, 2004.

[8] A. Bouziani and N.E. Benouar. Problème mixte avec conditions intégrales pour une classe d'équations hyperboliques. *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc.*, 3:137–145, 1996.

[9] A. Bouziani, N. Merazga, and S. Benamira. Galerkin method applied to a parabolic evolution problem with nonlocal boundary conditions. *Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl.*, 69:1515–1524, 2008.

[10] H. Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations.* Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.

[11] J.R. Cannon. The solution of the heat equation subject to the specification of energy. *Quart. Appl. Math*, 21:155–160, 1963.

[12] J.R. Cannon. *The One-Dimensional Heat Equation*, volume 23 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1984.

[13] J.R. Cannon, S.P. Esteva, and J. van der Hoek. A Galerkin procedure for the diffusion equation subject to the specification of mass. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, pages 499–515, 1987.

[14] T. Cheon and T. Shigehara. Realizing discontinuous wave functions with renormalized short-range potentials. *Phys. Lett. A*, 243:111–116, 1998.

[15] M. Crouzeix. Operators with numerical range in a parabola. *Arch. Math.*, 82:517–527, 2004.

[16] D.Q. Dai and Y. Huang. A moment problem for one-dimensional nonlinear pseudoparabolic equation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 328:1057–1067, 2007.

[17] M. Dehghan. On the solution of an initial-boundary value problem that combines Neumann and integral condition for the wave equation. *Numer. Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, 21:24–40, 2005.

[18] W. Desch and W. Schappacher. Some perturbation results for analytic semigroups. *Math. Ann.*, 281:157–162, 1988.

[19] P. Exner, H. Neidhardt, and V.A. Zagrebnov. Potential approximations to δ': an inverse Klauder phenomenon with norm-resolvent convergence. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 224:593–612, 2001.

[20] A. Guezane-Lakoud and D. Belakroum. Rothe's method for a telegraph equation with integral conditions. *Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl.*, 70:3842–3853, 2009.

[21] N.I. Ionkin and E.I. Moiceev. Solution of boundary value problem in heat conduction theory with nonlocal boundary conditions. *Differ. Equations*, 13:294–304, 1977.

[22] R.V. Kohn and F. Otto. Upper bounds on coarsening rates. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 229:375–395, 2002.

[23] M. Kramar, D. Mugnolo, and R. Nagel. Semigroups for initial-boundary value problems. In M. Iannelli and G. Lumer, editors, *Evolution Equations 2000: Applications to Physics, Industry, Life Sciences and Economics (Proceedings Levico Terme 2000)*, volume 55 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations*, pages 277–297, Basel, 2003. Birkäuser.

[24] D. Lesnic, L. Elliott, and D.B. Ingham. The solution of an inverse heat conduction problem subject to the specification of energies. *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, 41:25–32, 1998.

[25] A. Manavi, H. Vogt, and J. Voigt. Domination of semigroups associated with sectorial forms. *J. Oper. Theory*, 54:9–25, 2005.

[26] K. Maurin. Abbildungen vom Hilbert–Schmidtschen Typus und ihre Anwendungen. *Math. Scand.*, 9:359–371, 1961.

[27] S. Mesloub and A. Bouziani. Mixed problem with integral conditions for a certain class of hyperbolic equations. *J. Appl. Math.*, 1:107–116, 2001.

[28] D. Mugnolo and S. Romanelli. Dirichlet forms for general Wentzell boundary conditions, analytic semigroups, and cosine operator functions. *Electronic J. Differ. Equ.*, 118:1–20, 2006.

[29] S. Nicaise. Some results on spectral theory over networks, applied to nerve impulse transmission. In C. Brezinsky et al., editor, *Polynômes Orthogonaux et Applications (Proc. Bar-le-Duc 1984)*, volume 1171 of *Lect. Notes. Math.*, pages 532–541, Berlin, 1985. Springer-Verlag.

[30] E.M. Ouhabaz. *Analysis of Heat Equations on Domains*, volume 30 of *Lond. Math. Soc. Monograph Series*. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 2005.

[31] L.S. Pul'kina. Certain nonlocal problem for a degenerate hyperbolic equation. *Math. Notes*, 51:286–290, 1992.

[32] L.S. Pul'kina. Nonlocal problem with a first-kind integral condition for a multidimensional hyperbolic equation. *Dokl. Math.*, 76:741–743, 2007.

[33] P. Shi. Weak solution to an evolution problem with a nonlocal constraint. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 24:46, 1993.

[34] K. Taira. *Semigroups, boundary value problems and Markov processes*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[35] N.I. Yurchuk. Mixed problem with an integral condition for certain parabolic equations. *Differ. Equations*, 22:1457–1463, 1986.

Delio Mugnolo, Institut für Analysis, Universität Ulm, 89069 Ulm, Germany
E-mail address: `delio.mugnolo@uni-ulm.de`

Serge Nicaise, Université de Valenciennes et du Hainaut Cambrésis, LAMAV, FR CNRS 2956, ISTV, F-59313 - Valenciennes Cedex 9, France
E-mail address: `Serge.Nicaise@univ-valenciennes.fr`